



**Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
Permanent Council**

PC.DEL/696/04/Rev.1
27 July 2004

ENGLISH only

Bulgarian Chairmanship

OSCE CONFERENCE ON ANTI-SEMITISM

Berlin, 28 and 29 April 2004

CONSOLIDATED SUMMARY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction.....	1
(A) Annotated agenda.....	3
Opening of the Conference: Keynote session.....	3
Session 1: Legislative and institutional mechanisms and governmental action, including law enforcement.....	4
Session 2: The role of governments and civil society in promoting tolerance	5
Session 3: The role of education	6
Session 4: Information and awareness-raising: the role of the media in conveying and countering prejudice.....	7
Closing session: Development of conclusions and recommendations.....	8
(B) Agenda of the workshops.....	9
(C) Report of plenary sessions.....	11
Opening session:	11
Session 1: Legislative and institutional mechanisms and governmental action, including law enforcement.....	11
Session 2: The role of governments and civil society in promoting tolerance	15
Session 3: The role of education	17
Session 4: Information and awareness-raising: the role of the media in conveying and countering prejudice.....	20
Closing session: Development of conclusions and recommendations.....	22
(D) Annexes	
Annex 1: The Declaration of the Chairman-in-Office concluding the Conference	
Annex 2: Maastricht Ministerial Council Decision No. 4 on Tolerance and Non-Discrimination (MC.DEC/4/03)	
Annex 3: Statements	

INTRODUCTION

The Maastricht Ministerial Council Decision on Tolerance and Non-Discrimination decided “to follow up the work started at the OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism, held in Vienna on 19 and 20 June 2003 and welcomes the offer by Germany to host a second OSCE conference on this subject in Berlin on 28 and 29 April”. (See Annex 2 for the text of the decision). On 28 and 29 April the OSCE organized the second Conference on Anti-Semitism hosted by Germany in Berlin. In the subsequent months of 2004 the OSCE will hold two events: the OSCE Meeting on “The Relationship Between Racist, Xenophobic and Anti-Semitic Propaganda on the Internet and Hate Crimes” in Paris on 16 and 17 June and the second OSCE Conference on “Tolerance and the Fight Against Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination” in Brussels on 13 and 14 September.

The annotated agenda of the OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism was developed in Vienna in close co-operation with and consultation among a representative group of participating States, which had come together regularly since January 2004. The sustained attention from participating States in organizing the Conference resulted in high level political attendance at the Berlin Conference. Expert keynote speakers, introducers and moderators well known for their dedication in the fight against anti-Semitism set the tone for a very engaged discussion between the over 600 participants from governments, international organizations and non-governmental organizations.

The report of this Conference consists of the following parts:

- (A) The annotated agenda, comprising the names of the speakers and the conceptual background on which the discussions were based.
- (B) The agenda of the workshops, including the names of speakers.
- (C) A report of plenary sessions (including the results of the discussions at the workshops), an overview of interveners, a summary of general recommendations, as well as additional recommendations made by delegations, either during the sessions or after the sessions in writing. The text of the interventions by the introductory speakers is attached to each of the sessions.
- (D) The annexes contain the Declaration of the Chairman-in-Office concluding the Conference which he called “Berlin Declaration”, the Maastricht Ministerial Council Decision on Tolerance and Non-Discrimination (MC.DEC/4/03), the speeches of the keynote speakers in the opening session as well as the speeches from the introducers in the plenary sessions. The “Berlin Declaration” contains commitments taken by the Permanent Council of the OSCE.

As the interventions by the introducers for each session are attached, the summaries of the discussions are limited to the debate following the introducers’ interventions. In accordance with standard OSCE human dimension meeting reporting, the recommendations are addressed to either OSCE participating States or OSCE structures. Although most recommendations were addressed to OSCE participating States, it goes without saying that NGOs and other international organizations have an important role to play in ensuring the

implementation of some of these recommendations as well. Finally, the list of participants and remaining statements handed in to the Secretariat have been posted on the official website of the OSCE.

(A) ANNOTATED AGENDA

Opening of the Conference: Keynote session

In their decision on Tolerance and Non-Discrimination, Ministers in Maastricht reaffirmed their commitment to promote tolerance and non-discrimination and voiced concern, *inter alia*, about anti-Semitism. In this vein they decided to follow up the work started at the OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism, held in Vienna on 19 and 20 June 2003, and welcomed the offer by Germany to host a second OSCE conference on this subject in Berlin on 28 and 29 April 2004.

The goal of the initial session is twofold: to present the problem which anti-Semitism and its manifestations pose throughout the OSCE area and, by presenting best practices, highlight additional measures, for example as a part of national action plans, which participating States may wish to take in order to combat this scourge with particular regard to Maastricht recommendations. This session will raise awareness at a high political level and provide the foundation for the subsequent deliberations of the Conference.

As the host, the President of Germany will address the Conference, followed by an address by the Bulgarian OSCE Chairman in Office. Subsequent keynote addresses could be given by

Madam Simone Veil,
Paul Spiegel,
Max Jakobson,
Elie Wiesel.

Subsequent sessions of the Conference will focus on concrete measures and best practices to prevent and combat anti-Semitism, *inter alia*, through the rule of law, anti-discrimination legislation and law enforcement, through collecting and analysing hate crime statistics, through inter-faith and inter-community dialogue, education and training and through information dissemination and awareness-raising. By and large the Conference will follow the organizational pattern of the Vienna Conference.

Following or preceding the four sessions, the respective moderators or their designated representatives will chair workshops to discuss further aspects of the subject matter of the sessions. While the workshops will be open to all participants, practitioners with expertise in each area under discussion will be encouraged to participate in these informal discussions. The moderators will introduce the results of these discussions in the plenary sessions.

Note taker: Ms. Nilvana Darama, Counsellor, Turkish delegation to the OSCE.

Side events, *inter alia*, on the Internet, will inform participants on concrete measures and best practices already implemented in participating States.

Session 1: Legislative and institutional mechanisms and governmental action, including law enforcement

Moderator: Claudia Roth, German Government Commissioner for Human Rights Policy and Humanitarian Aid at the Foreign Office

Introducers: Representative Chris Smith, Member of the US Congress
Pierre Lellouche, French MP

Note taker: Dr. Eltje Aderhold, Counsellor, German delegation to the OSCE

This session will focus on the implementation of the Ministerial Council Decision No. 4/03 (MC.DEC/4/03). What national legislation exists to combat hate crimes and hate speech related to anti-Semitism? Where such legislation exists what steps have been taken by participating States to make it more effective? What national institutional mechanisms exist to collect reliable data and information on hate crimes; how effective are they; in what ways can they be made more effective? Where such mechanisms do not exist, what steps are being taken to establish them or designate to other existing bodies such responsibilities? What steps have been taken by participating States to inform the ODIHR about existing legislation regarding crimes related to intolerance and discrimination? How could the ODIHR best assist in the review of such legislation? What steps have been taken by the ODIHR, in co-operation, *inter alia*, with the UNCERD, the ECRI and the EUMC, as well as relevant NGOs, to serve as a collection point for information and statistics? How could ODIHR facilitate reporting by participating States to ODIHR? How should ODIHR present and publish this sensitive information? For example how will it reconcile statistics from States that collect information according to different methodologies? What kind of information and statistics collected by UNCERD, ECRI, EUMC and other international actors, as well as relevant NGOs, are already available. How should ODIHR co-operate with these organizations?

Speakers will also examine best practices for law enforcement and experience with criminal prosecution of violence.

Topics also may include, *inter alia*:

- Implementation of the Ministerial Council Decision on Tolerance and Non-Discrimination (MC.DEC/4/03);
- Best practices for law enforcement and experience with criminal prosecution of violence;
- Key elements of legislation designed to prevent and combat hate crimes.

Workshops (in parallel):

- State Action: Legislation, Enforcement, Prosecution, and Training
- Promoting Tolerance: Media, *inter alia*, Internet, NGOs, and Religious Leaders

Workshops (in parallel):

- Implementation of ODIHR's Tasking under Paragraph 7 in the Maastricht Ministerial Decision on Tolerance and Non-Discrimination
- Diversity-Training and Holocaust Education

Session 2: The role of governments and civil society in promoting tolerance

Moderator: Professor Gert Weisskirchen, Vice-President, OSCE PA

Introducers: Edgar M. Bronfman, President of the World Jewish Congress
Mrs. Ella Pamfilova, Chairperson of the Commission on Human Rights under the President of the Russian Federation

Note taker: Mr. Timon Bo Salomonson, Second Secretary, Belgian delegation to the OSCE

This session will build on the broad debate of the OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism held in Vienna as well as the Human Dimension Implementation Meeting in Warsaw held in October 2003, which recognized the special nature of anti-Semitism. This debate focused on inter-faith and intercultural dialogue as well as co-operation between relevant actors, particularly with regard to NGOs. What measures have been taken by participating States to promote inter-faith and intercultural dialogue, including as a part of national action plans? How can the role of NGOs in promoting tolerance be supported? What can the OSCE and its institutions in co-operation with the UNESCO and other bodies do to strengthen the promotion of tolerance? How can inter-community co-operation and dialogue dispel misconceptions and myths about other communities? How are national and international interfaith groups working towards this? How can different communities co-operate to tackle common difficulties in the sphere of intolerance?

Topics also may include, *inter alia*:

- Additional ways to strengthen the promotion of tolerance and non-discrimination;
- Inter-faith and intercultural dialogue;
- The role of the OSCE and its institutions in co-operation with UNESCO and other bodies in strengthening the promotion of tolerance;
- How can the role of NGOs in promoting tolerance and dialogue be supported?;
- Additional ways to strengthen a culture of respect for diversity.

Session 3: The role of education

Moderator: Yehuda Bauer, Adviser to International Task Force for Holocaust Education, Remembrance and Research and former Chairman of Yad Vashem International Institute for Holocaust Research

Introducers: Professor Jerzy Jedlicki, Institute of History, Polish Academy of Science, President of Programming Council of Association against anti-Semitism and Xenophobia "Otwarta Rzeczpospolita"
Ambassador Giorgio Franchetti Pardo, Chairman, Italian Presidency of the Task Force on Holocaust Education, Remembrance and Research
David A. Harris, Executive Director, the American Jewish Committee

Note taker: Mr. Bjorn Svenungsen, Second Secretary, Norwegian delegation to the OSCE

The broad debate of the Vienna Conference on Anti-Semitism, as well as the Human Dimension Implementation Meeting held in 2003, have highlighted education and training as vital factors in developing tolerance and understanding. Recommendations to those meetings underlined the importance of instilling concepts of tolerance and non-discrimination at an early stage as part of primary education, and reinforcing it as part of secondary education. Education programmes, curricula and training should also aim to be forward looking and be designed to take into account the diverse and multicultural nature of society.

This session could contribute to operationalizing those recommendations. Participating States could exchange concrete best practices regarding the development of school curricula and teacher-education programs. In what regard can the OSCE and its institutions, in co-operation with the UNESCO, UNICEF and other international actors like the International Task Force for Holocaust Education, Remembrance and Research, assist participating States in developing educational programmes?

Topics also may include, *inter alia*:

- Key elements and development of school curricula and teacher-education programmes;
- Teaching of history;
- How can the OSCE and its institutions, in co-operation with other international organizations and actors, assist participating States in developing educational programmes?

Dinner hosted by the President of the Federal Republic of Germany (by invitation)

Workshops (in parallel):

- Anti-Semitism in the Media, *inter alia*, Internet: Problems and Solutions
- Contemporary Anti-Semitism

Session 4: Information and awareness-raising: The role of the media in conveying and countering prejudice

Moderator: Ambassador Luigi Vittorio Ferraris, academic and former Deputy Foreign Minister of Italy

Introducers: Edward Koch, Former Mayor of New York City
Professor Odd-Bjørn Fure, Norwegian Holocaust Centre, Director of Research, Centre for Study of the Holocaust and Religious Minorities in Norway

Note taker: Mr. Karl Olson, Adviser, US delegation to the OSCE

Following the debate of the Vienna Conference on Anti-Semitism as well as the Human Dimension Implementation Meeting held in 2003, this session offers an opportunity to register to what extent media, including internet, have strengthened their role in promoting tolerance and preventing hate crimes. Freedom of the media has its counterpart in the responsibility of the media as to the content of the information they are conveying. The fight against hate crimes should, however, be balanced with respect for free expression and a free media. This session could contribute to operationalizing relevant recommendations. Representatives of media could discuss how best to avoid anti-Semitic messages in the media, including internet, as well as best practices to promote tolerance and community cohesion through the media. Participating States could elaborate on the role of media as part of a comprehensive strategy in the framework of national action plans.

A side-event will be organized to discuss the need to combat hate crimes, which can be fuelled by anti-Semitic propaganda on the internet. Participation of relevant NGOs as well as other actors would be most welcome.

Topics also may include, *inter alia*:

- The role of the media in promoting tolerance and preventing hate crimes;
- How best to avoid anti-Semitic messages in the media and internet;
- The role of the media as part of a comprehensive strategy for actions at national level;
- The role of the OSCE and its institutions.

Closing session: Development of conclusions and recommendations

In this session the four moderators will summarize discussions and recommendations made in the sessions on how the OSCE participating States and OSCE structures can strengthen and operationalize their efforts to combat anti-Semitism, as a part of OSCE action to promote tolerance and combat discrimination. There will also be possibility for reactions from the floor. The results of the Conference will be brought forward to the Human Dimension Implementation Meeting in Warsaw in October 2004.

In order to more accurately reflect the results of the Conference, participants are encouraged to submit in writing to the Chairman-in-Office any recommendations they wish to make. It would be helpful if participants could specify for whom the recommendations are intended, for example, individual OSCE participating States, the OSCE as a whole, OSCE structures and institutions such as the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, the High Commissioner on National Minorities, and the Representative on the Freedom of the Media or OSCE field operations.

(B) AGENDA OF THE WORKSHOPS

Day 1

28 April 2004

WORKSHOPS (in parallel)

State Action: Legislation, Enforcement, Prosecution, and Training

Moderator: Claudia Roth, German Government Commissioner for Human Rights Policy and Humanitarian Aid at the Foreign Office

Introducer: Fiamma Nirenstein, journalist and expert/commentator on Jewish issues

Assistant: Dr. Eltje Aderhold, Counsellor, German delegation to the OSCE

Promoting Tolerance: Media, i.a. Internet, NGOs, and Religious Leaders

Moderator: Prof. Gert Weisskirchen, Vice-President, OSCE PA

Introducer: Fred Zeidman, Chairman of the US Holocaust Memorial Council

Assistant: Mr. Timon Bo Salomonson, Second Secretary, Belgian delegation to the OSCE

WORKSHOPS (in parallel)

Implementation of ODIHR's Tasking Under Para 7 in the Maastricht Ministerial Decision on Tolerance and Non-Discrimination

Moderator: Mr. Michael Head, Chairman of the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI)

Introducer: Amb. Christian Strohal, ODIHR Director

Introducer: Dr. Beate Winkler, Director, European Union Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia

Assistant: Mr. Bjorn Svenungsen, Second Secretary, Norwegian delegation to the OSCE

Diversity-Training and Holocaust Education

Moderator: Yehuda Bauer, Adviser to International Task Force for Holocaust Education, Remembrance and Research and former Chairman of Yad Vashem International Institute for Holocaust Research

Introducer: Dr. Heléne Lööw, Director of the Living History Forum, Sweden

Assistant: Mr. Kenneth Mayer, Political Officer, US delegation to the OSCE

Day 2

29 April 2004

WORKSHOPS (in parallel)

Anti-Semitism in the Media, i.a. Internet: Problems and Solutions

Moderator: Amb. Prof. Luigi Vittorio Ferraris

Introducer: Freimut Duve, publicist

Introducer: Miklos Haraszti, OSCE Representative on Freedom of the Media

Assistant: Mr. Giorgio Novello, First Counsellor, Italian delegation to the OSCE

Contemporary anti-Semitism

Moderator: Prof. Gert Weisskirchen, Vice-President, OSCE PA

Introducer: Abraham Foxman, National Director, ADL

Assistant: Mr. Bjorn Svenungsen, Second Secretary, Norwegian delegation to the OSCE

(C) REPORT OF PLENARY SESSIONS

Opening session: Presenting the context

Summary and general recommendations

The Conference was opened by H.E. Johannes Rau, President of Germany, who underlined the relevance of the OSCE as the first security organization recognizing the link between international security and human rights, in the work aimed at fostering tolerance and non-discrimination, including combating anti-Semitism. He stressed the need for individual and collective efforts by the participating States to combat all forms of racism and anti-Semitism.

The address of H.E. Johannes Rau was followed by an address of H.E. Solomon Passy, the OSCE Chairman-in-Office. He reiterated the OSCE's commitment to combat all forms of anti-Semitism and stressed the Chairmanship's resolve to follow-up the work started at the OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism held in Vienna in June 2003. He highlighted the primary role of education in the fight against anti-Semitism and stressed that careful consideration of anti-Semitism can result in determining how best to respond other forms of racism and intolerance.

Opening addresses by President Rau and H.E. Passy were followed by the keynote speeches of Simone Veil, Paul Spiegel, Max Jakobson and Elie Wiesel. They set the context for subsequent discussions in the plenary sessions and workshops. Keynote speakers presented the problem posed by anti-Semitism and its manifestations throughout the OSCE area and expressed concern over the rise in anti-Semitic incidents in recent years. In this respect, they welcomed the Conference as an important signal of solidarity with Jews and of political will to address this problem. They recalled the OSCE commitments in the area of tolerance and non-discrimination and underlined the direct responsibility of individual participating States in the fight against anti-Semitism and all forms of racism, discrimination, and extremism, including terrorism. The keynote speakers clearly stated that one cannot speak of more dangerous and less dangerous anti-Semitism and that no form of anti-Semitism can be treated more tolerantly than others. Criticism of Israel that is so virulent that it crosses over into anti-Semitism, for example, because it denigrates all Jews, was cautioned against.

Recommendations made at this session endorsed the Decision on Tolerance and Non-Discrimination taken by the Maastricht Ministerial Council and highlighted the importance of going beyond Maastricht in developing commitments and co-operation, also with regard to the role of education and media.

Session 1: Legislative and institutional mechanisms and governmental action, including law enforcement

After the speeches of the two introducers (see Annex 3), the following delegations participated in this discussion (in speaking order): Ireland (on behalf of the European Union: the acceding countries Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania,

Malta, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia and the candidate countries Bulgaria, Romania and Turkey aligned themselves with this statement), Germany, Canada, Romania, Slovenia, United States of America, Sweden, France, United Kingdom, Spain, Italy and the Czech Republic.

Summary and general recommendations

In this session, in which mostly senior political decision-makers spoke, delegations expressed their concern over incidents of anti-Semitism as a distinct and specific form of intolerance. Delegations condemned anti-Semitism as a violation of human dignity and a threat not only to Jewish people and Jewish communities but open and democratic society as a whole. Delegations confirmed their determination to work together in combating anti-Semitism. They stressed joint responsibility and the importance of international co-operation in further developing a common strategy for combating anti-Semitism. With their substantial contributions, reflecting the diverse experiences throughout the OSCE area, delegations recognized the OSCE as a unique forum to this end.

An important number of delegations agreed that criticism of Israel can, at times, serve as a cover for anti-Semitism or be motivated by it, although all delegations also stressed that criticism of any government's policies, including Israel's, is legitimate and an essential feature of democratic political systems. Delegations agreed that international developments or political issues, including those in Israel or elsewhere in the Middle East, never justify anti-Semitism.

Delegations presented best practices of state action. They highlighted hate crime legislation as a core element of an effective legislative framework and proposed to regard bias motivation as an aggravating circumstance when the penalty is determined. Speakers underlined the importance of law enforcement and the role of human rights jurisdiction in combating anti-Semitism. Delegations presented, *inter alia*, models and best practices related to national action plans, data collection and reporting systems, umbrella anti-discrimination laws, interministerial committees and ministerial working groups, institution building, the role of ombudspersons, hate crime units in police forces, national networks of focal points for information and training, monitoring hate crimes including systems of measuring levels of intolerance in societies and compiling data, historical commissions, projects to increase awareness and disseminate knowledge as well as programmes of education, information and social work with immigrants. Delegations also presented models of dialogue among governmental authorities, Jewish community representatives, NGOs and other sectors of society designed to overcome distrust and hostility born of ignorance. Delegations underlined the role of Members of Parliaments in supporting and adding to governmental action.

Delegations agreed that legislative action has to be embedded in a comprehensive strategy bringing together all actors in society and including Holocaust remembrance and education, awareness-raising in media and a pro-active role of media, interfaith- and intercommunity dialogue. Delegations welcomed the commitment of civil society associations and action groups to support governmental action.

Delegations called upon governments and other actors to implement the Decision on Tolerance and Non-Discrimination adopted by the Maastricht Ministerial Council and the Decision on Combating Anti-Semitism taken by the PC in April 2004. They highlighted the

role of ODIHR in co-operation with other actors in this regard and were looking forward to assisting ODIHR in the furtherance of its tasking.

The delegation of Spain announced its willingness to organize and hold in Cordoba the next OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism, in the event the Ministerial Council decides to hold one.

The Czech Republic conveyed a message to the Conference by Vaclav Havel.

Additional Recommendations

To OSCE participating States

United States of America

- National and local leaders must speak out in support of tolerance and ensure that law enforcement fully prosecutes hate crimes;
- Governments should fully implement the 22 April PC Decision on Combating Anti-Semitism, especially as regards the gathering of information and statistics on anti-Semitic and other hate crimes;
- Governments should develop action strategies to combat anti-Semitism, which should be open to review and regular oversight by legislatures.

United Kingdom

- In its work against anti-Semitism and all other forms of intolerance, the OSCE should embrace, promote and even facilitate dialogue between different faith groups and race communities as a key means of tackling these problems;
- OSCE States should join the UK in implementing strong anti-racism legislation;
- OSCE States should assess the problems of anti-Semitism and other forms of intolerance in their own countries as frankly as the EU Monitoring Centre has done in the European Union, and see whether the EUMC's recommendations are relevant to them;
- OSCE States should condemn anti-Semitism with one voice, through Solomon Passy's declaration concluding this conference, and implement the decision which he will include in it.

Austria

- The Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights should play a more active role with regard to having reliable and complete data regarding acts of violence with a racist or anti-Semitic background;
- Appropriate laws should ensure that discrimination, violence against particular groups in society and expressions of racist sentiment in all forms are regarded as criminal

offences and, where necessary, subject to penalties, and that consequences under civil law are also foreseen for discriminatory conduct;

- In co-operation with civil society, an atmosphere of mutual respect and recognition of the rights of others should be created;
- Political debate, including foreign policy discussions concerning the conflict in the Middle East, for example, should never be a pretext for anti-Semitism.

Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, International Helsinki Federation

- Participating States should condemn unequivocally all manifestations of anti-Semitism;
- Participating States should ensure that their legal systems provide effective protection against all forms of anti-Semitism;
- Participating States should ensure swift and thorough investigations into incidents of anti-Semitic attacks and discrimination and effective systems for monitoring and recording anti-Semitic incidents in conformity with international human rights standards;
- Participating States should develop awareness-raising campaigns and educational programs on anti-Semitism and the binding nature of international human rights and anti-discrimination norms for the general public and specific target groups such as young people, law enforcement, teachers and media professionals.

Jacob Blaustein Institute for the Advancement of Human Rights

- Participating States should comply with their Copenhagen Commitments by adopting domestic legislation and enforcing it vigorously;
- Participating States should establish systems of monitoring incidents of anti-Semitism in each country.

Human Rights First

- Participating States should adopt a plan of action to be implemented in every OSCE country that will include improved monitoring and reporting and strengthening of law enforcement mechanisms;
- Participating States should empower the Office of Democratic Institutions and Human Rights to actively seek information from each OSCE member state, make recommendations, and issue public reports concerning anti-Semitism and other forms of racism.

Leadership Conference on Civil Rights

- Participating States should reaffirm OSCE commitments to take effective measures to combat anti-Semitism;

- Participating States should authorize OSCE to monitor incidents of anti-Semitism and other hate crime, publicly report findings, and encourage participating States to institute hate crime data collection mechanism where none exist;
- Participating States should task OSCE with monitoring and reporting about the nature of anti-Semitism to help States identify, report and respond to anti-Semitic incidents accurately;
- Participating States should urge OSCE's law enforcement arm to craft a training model to ensure law enforcement officials can recognize anti-Semitic and other hate crimes and develop transparent procedures for recording and responding to these incidents;
- Participating States should ensure that each nation's national legal systems provide effective protection against all forms of anti-Semitism in conformity with international and regional anti discrimination and human rights standards;
- Participating States should undertake measures to ensure effective implementation of legislation prohibiting discrimination and incitement to hatred and that action is taken against institutions and individuals responsible for violating these norms;
- Participating States should ensure law enforcement and anti-bias training.

To OSCE institutions

Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, International Helsinki Federation

- OSCE take the lead in convening an inter-agency meeting, bringing together relevant actors at the national and international levels to set up a process to review — and identify gaps and shortcomings regarding — States' implementation of their commitments pertaining to combating anti-Semitism;
- Shortcomings identified with respect to each State's performance in meeting its commitments — as well as best practices, if any — should be made public.

Session 2: The role of governments and civil society in promoting tolerance

After the speeches of the two introducers (see Annex 3), the following delegations participated in this discussion (in speaking order): United States of America, Croatia, Poland, Switzerland, Estonia, Latvia, Ukraine (on behalf of GUUAM), Norway, Russia, Hungary, Serbia and Montenegro, Ireland (on behalf of European Union: the acceding countries Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia and the candidate countries Bulgaria, Romania and Turkey aligned themselves with this statement) Conference of European Rabbis, Netherlands, Belarus, Albania and Magen League.

Summary and general recommendations

In this session, many participants stressed that the lessons of history should never be forgotten. The Holocaust should have taught the result of hate, but the memory of the atrocities is receding in public memory, thus causing a rise in intolerance. Along with coming to terms with the past, the importance of looking ahead was emphasized. Therefore, participants felt that the memory of the Holocaust should teach us to remain vigilant, as anti-Semitism is far from eradicated in the world today.

Participants drew attention to the importance of making the fight against anti-Semitism part of a common approach in the fight against any form of intolerance and discrimination, while taking into consideration its unique characteristics. In this fight, participants called upon governments and civil society to be open to one another and act together. It was highlighted that participating States should not permit anti-Semitic crimes to be shrugged off as inevitable side effects of inter-ethnic conflicts. Public officials were equally called upon to draw attention to anti-Semitic acts and condemn them publicly. Participants also stressed the need to ensure responsible behaviour of the media.

One participant stressed that tolerance like hatred is a learned behaviour passed from one generation to another. In that context, the important role of education in the fight against anti-Semitism was highlighted by several participants, stressing that knowledge of other cultures and mutual respect should be taught in every school system and that public officials should benefit from human rights education as well. Participants also pointed out that the general public should be engaged in the fight against anti-Semitism through awareness-raising campaigns. Dialogue between different faith groups and ethnic communities to promote understanding and reduce intolerance was highlighted as the most effective solution to dealing with anti-Semitism and other forms of intolerance.

Participants felt that the experience of ODIHR, the HCNM and the RFM should be used more effectively in fighting anti-Semitism. In that context, it was recommended to task ODIHR to help States to collect hate crime statistics, promote dialogue, gather examples of good practices, help develop national legislation against hate crimes and promote tolerance through education. One participant recommended creating an OSCE High Representative to improve the fight against anti-Semitism.

At the workshop on “Promoting Tolerance: Media, *inter alia*, Internet, NGOs and Religious Leaders”, participants stressed the priority of protecting national minorities. As tension sometimes exists between national legislation protecting freedom of speech and the use of media and internet for hate speech, participants proposed to encourage private companies within the internet sector to self-regulate, by not hosting hate promoters. The media should also be educated on what anti-Semitism is and sensitized to the negative impact of stereotypes. Moving beyond established patterns of inter-community dialogue to include non-traditional partners was recommended by one participant.

Additional recommendations

To OSCE participating States

European Union

- Dialogue between different faith groups and race communities to promote understanding and reduce intolerance is the most effective solution to dealing with anti-Semitism and other forms of intolerance;
- OSCE meetings themselves should be used as forums for interfaith dialogue;
- Anti-Semitism must be fought not only by Jewish people, but also by Muslims, Christians and those of other faiths;
- While respecting its unique characteristics, the fight against anti-Semitism should be undertaken in the wider context of fighting racism and xenophobia in a contemporary world.

Austria

- Participating States should keep alive the memory of the unique nature of the Holocaust as a warning to future generations;
- Dialogue between different religions and cultures should be strengthened, because a constructive encounter with what is important to persons of another group can make a great contribution to mutual understanding.

Magen League (NGO)

- A permanent position of OSCE commissioner or representative dealing with anti-Semitism or fighting anti-Semitism should be established.

Jacob Blaustein Institute for the Advancement of Human Rights

- A special representative on combating anti-Semitism within the OSCE should be established.

Human Rights First

- A high-level position within the OSCE structure, responsible for oversight of monitoring, reporting, and action on anti-Semitism and other forms of racism should be established.

Session 3: The role of education

After the speeches of the three introducers (see Annex 3), the following delegations participated in this discussion (in speaking order): Lithuania, United States of America, Ireland (on behalf of European Union: the acceding countries Cyprus, the Czech Republic,

Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia and the candidate countries Bulgaria, Romania and Turkey aligned themselves with this statement), Holy See, Conseil Représentatif des Institutions Juives de France (CRIF), Denmark, Slovakia, Austria, Kazakhstan, Israel and Central Council of Jews in France.

Summary and general recommendations

In this session several participants stressed that youth is the target for education, and that students could be actively involved when developing action plans to combat anti-Semitism. Education in order to combat anti-Semitism is a long-term effort, but it is necessary. Training of teachers needed much attention as quality education to tackle anti-Semitism requires quality teaching. National action plans addressing training and education should be developed. A number of delegations proposed that a compulsory component to raise awareness, understanding and respect of the various cultures, religions and traditions in the OSCE region should be introduced at training colleges. A number of delegations drew attention to the need to include policy makers, elected government officials and service providers, including police officials in training programmes.

A number of delegations stressed that in order to ensure that the history and message of the Holocaust is properly and effectively conveyed, it is necessary to provide teaching material that focuses on the facts, as well as history teachers who are aware of the research that informs these materials. Research must be given priority in order to find better ways to educate about the Holocaust. The introduction of specific curricula for Holocaust education was recommended as was reviewing textbooks to identify and remove possible anti-Semitic content. It was noted by one participant that the history of the Holocaust not only had to be taught accurately, but also it had to be easily accessible to all. Countries must confront their own actions during the Holocaust honestly. A part of the strategy to fight anti-Semitism was to keep alive the remembrance of the horror of the Holocaust, although a participant noted that students should also learn about the lives of Holocaust victims, not only their deaths.

Several participants highlighted the need for proper legislation, but stressed that legislation alone is of no use unless the laws are implemented. Innovative solutions for implementation had to be developed, with focus on training and comprehensive education. One participant stressed that the various religious communities should increase their dialogue and work shoulder by shoulder to accept each others' cultures. Another participant stressed the importance of a lively civil society in Holocaust education. Different groups, including NGOs, and, where appropriate, governments can collaborate in the production of curricula on anti-Semitism. The importance of the media in education, including messages sent out by TV and the internet, was highlighted by several participants. One participant recommended that States should use diplomatic channels to address the problem of school children being taught to hate Jews and other "infidels" in some countries.

At the workshop on "Diversity Training and Holocaust Education" three themes ran through the discussion. They were: who to teach about the Holocaust and the importance of diversity; how to teach persons on these subjects; and what to teach these persons.

There was broad agreement that educators must be taught as a key step to breaking the transmission of hate to future generations. It was noted that the teachers of hate must be identified so that they can be educated. Specific groups, like social workers and law enforcement personnel, were also identified as targets for education. Educational

methodologies should be adapted to specific contexts and to specific types of anti-Semitism. Teaching methods that brought different groups of persons together have been shown to be effective in developing tolerance as have those highlighting past examples of peaceful coexistence. Participants generally agreed that not only the Holocaust should be taught, but also anti-Semitic developments since 1945 and manifestations of other forms of intolerance. A number of speakers suggested that people should be educated about Jewish life today so that Jews are “normalized” and not viewed as “the other” or the unknown. One participant stressed that educators should teach critical thinking skills so that those learning develop the ability to identify faulty thinking often associated with bias. Educators should also look for ways to build self-esteem, because individuals who are secure in their identity and self image are less likely to be prejudiced against others. Holocaust museums were highlighted as potentially valuable education tools as well as programs that bring people to Holocaust sites.

Additional recommendations

To OSCE participating States

European Union

- Participating States should ensure that the history and message of the Holocaust is properly and effectively conveyed. It is necessary to provide teaching materials that focus on the facts, as well as history teachers who are aware of the research that informs these materials;
- Studies of the present should not be neglected. Confronting the past and exploring the present is the key to building a future of inclusiveness and tolerance;
- Formal education should proactively promote tolerance and a community of values that recognises fully the human rights of all people, while instilling respect for the diversity of culture, race, opinion and belief on our Continent and beyond;
- A compulsory component to raise awareness, understanding and respect of the various cultures, religions and traditions in the OSCE region should be introduced at training colleges;
- Training on racism, xenophobia, anti-Semitism and discrimination should be targeted to policy makers and service providers simultaneously;
- Elected government officials should be offered the opportunity to take the same training as their public servants.

Holy See

- Religious education can and should provide hope and direction for positive living in human solidarity and harmony in our complex modern times;
- Educational institutions in both Catholic and Jewish communities should make every effort, as appropriate to their particular context, to expose students to an objective knowledge and respect for the other community’s belief;

- Governments and civil authorities should educate their citizens in a similar way;
- Among the sources of information, special attention should be devoted to history books, mass media and the internet.

Jacob Blaustein Institute for the Advancement of Human Rights

- Participating States should link educational programs, including both Holocaust education and general tolerance education, to focus on fighting contemporary anti-Semitism.

Session 4: Information and awareness-raising: the role of the media in conveying and countering prejudice

After the speeches of two introducers (see Annex 3), the following delegations participated in this discussion (in speaking order): United States of America, Turkey, Ireland (on behalf of European Union: the acceding countries Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia and the candidate countries Bulgaria, Romania and Turkey aligned themselves with this statement), OSCE Representative on Freedom of the Media, Ms. Barbara Hearing (Vice president of the OSCE PA), Morocco, Canadian Jewish Congress, France, Greece, Armenia, Mr. Alcee Hastings (OSCE PA), Georgia, Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch, Jacob Blaustein Institute, Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, Human Rights First, Euro-Asian Jewish Congress, International League of Human Rights, Chair of the Jewish Community in Baku, Mr. Jerry S. Grafstein (OSCE PA), Hagalil online, United Kingdom, France and Switzerland.

Summary and general recommendations

In this session some of the participants said that anti-Semitism can be “industrialized” by the media. Television’s sensational focus on violence can foster anti-Semitism. They noticed that failure to respond vigorously to bias-motivated crimes polarizes an entire community and threatens civil society and democracy. Participants highlighted a special role that media should play to ensure that its message is not tainted with hate or incitement to violence. Media owners, including Internet service providers, and journalists’ organizations should promote responsible journalism with codes of conduct. One participant suggested that media organizations should reach out to journalists serving minority communities to offer professional training. Some participants underlined the opportunity to embrace the media as a tool to promote tolerance, rather than seek to control or to regulate it. Participants encouraged the Representative on Freedom of the Media to continue his active role in promoting tolerance. Participants discussed that, with the proliferation of new Medias, particular attention should be given to the fact that anonymous expression of opinion does not revoke liability. Organizations can counterbalance anti-Semitism on the Internet by posting their own factual information so that search engines pick it up. Participants were urged to use the Internet (“web logs” or “blogs”) to expose hate speech.

At the workshop on Anti-Semitism in the Media, *inter alia*, Internet: Problems and Solutions participants focused on the risks of unilateral, unbalanced media reporting. If

“classical” anti-Semitic stereotypes are now rare in the media (with the exception of some Internet web sites), reports on Israel’s role in the Middle East conflict tend at times to go beyond the line between legitimate criticism of Israel and anti-Semitism. It was said that education and promotion of media awareness, encouragement of the young to look at the Internet critically, promotion of dialogue especially among silent majorities, can all be useful instruments against anti-Semitism in the media.

Additional recommendations

To OSCE participating States

United States of America

- Avoid state interference in media in favour of fostering a free and flourishing media that can serve as a platform for debunking the myths and lies that foster prejudice;
- Actively seek out media opportunities and launch media campaigns to draw attention to new laws or initiatives to counter anti-Semitism and as a means to raise public awareness.

Canada

- Participating States should implement an action plan which allows all member States to converge their ideas of how best to implement the OSCE PA Resolution to condemn Anti-Semitism in all of its recent manifestations. The follow up plan could be labelled “the Four Mores”:
 - More statistics: We must keep track, State by State, region by region, of the Anti-Semitic incidents;
 - More law enforcement: We need more specialized law enforcement directed towards the complex matter of prosecuting hate incidents;
 - More education: We need more and specialized public and private education at all levels. Hate is a learned experience;
 - More restraint in the media: It is clear that the media must become aware that it has a special role to play ensuring that its message is not tainted with hate or incitement to violence.

European Union

- Special emphasis should be laid on the necessity to promote appropriate steps in the field of education of young people, training of teachers and awareness-raising of users;
- Participating States of the OSCE should make full use of the tools of the Organization in the fight against anti-Semitic hate speech in the media and, in particular to encourage the office of the Representative on the Freedom of the Media to follow closely this issue.

To the OSCE

United Kingdom

- In order to reduce the numbers of people who progress to such levels of hate and prejudice that they host anti-Semitic messages in the media and the Internet, OSCE should identify communities which have significant, if small numbers of people who send out these messages;
- The majority in these communities usually is not anti-Semitic, so the OSCE should sponsor and support governments, NGOs and individuals who seek out and meet those silent majorities, to set up programmes to educate them that Jews are people little different from themselves;
- Map positive contacts between local Muslim and local Jewish communities. If there are insufficient local Jews or Muslims then OSCE can sponsor contacts on the Internet;
- Facilitate Jews and Muslims to share best practice in protecting themselves against their common enemies, including neo-fascists;
- Encourage joint work on university campuses when each other's rights are under threat e.g. when examinations are set on days which are religious holidays;
- Study religious texts together and sponsor visits to each other's places of worship;
- Develop together arts programmes;
- Play football together, especially at school age;
- Set up dialogue groups, especially facilitated discussions on the Israel/Palestine problem in order to address and unpick stereotypes;
- Support the silent Muslim majorities to express their shame and horror at anti-Semitic filth from the small minority of extremists in their community.

Closing session: Development of conclusions and recommendations

The following delegations participated in this session: Germany, Ireland (on behalf of European Union, the acceding countries Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia and the candidate countries Bulgaria, Romania and Turkey aligned themselves with this statement), the United States of America, Russia, Israel and Germany.

Summary and general recommendations

Delegations reaffirmed their responsibility and commitment to take an active part in the follow-up to the Berlin Conference. They acknowledged recommendations made during the working sessions related to legislative and institutional mechanisms, to the promotion of tolerance, to the role of education and to the role of media. Speakers highlighted the key role

of the ODIHR in serving, *inter alia*, as a data collection point and urged all participating States, NGOs and others to work in partnership with ODIHR. They welcomed the efforts of NGOs in struggling against anti-Semitism and encouraged co-operation of NGOs in implementing recommendations.

In this session respective moderators introduced the results of the workshops which had not preceded the relevant plenary sessions.

The discussion in the workshop on State Action: Legislation, Enforcement, Prosecution, and Training focused on ways to strengthen research capacities, data collection and data assessment. The discussion highlighted the need to bring together existing structures and activities through building networks. In that connection, it was said that networking could significantly improve the use of existing structures of State bodies and non-governmental organizations, as well as the work of research institutes throughout the OSCE area. Contributions to the workshop also focused on anti-Semitism in the media, in particular hate propaganda on the Internet.

At the workshop on the Implementation of ODIHR's Tasking under Paragraph 7 in the Maastricht Ministerial Decision on Tolerance and Non-Discrimination, it was suggested that the ODIHR arrange regular meetings, as necessary, with other relevant international organizations and agencies so that it can identify gaps, opportunities for joint action and avoid duplication as it builds its operational activities. It was also suggested that ODIHR develop a network of focal points for information in participating States. The first emphasis in the follow up was on the participating States and their obligation to provide the ODIHR with statistics and other information as raw material. It was suggested that areas of joint inter-agency action be identified urgently. ODIHR should be proactive about obtaining data from participating States. It should also provide detailed information about the human and financial resources it requires to fulfil its tolerance mandates. One participant noted that, in light of the Maastricht Decision on Tolerance and Non-Discrimination and April 2004 PC Decision on Combating anti-Semitism, ODIHR's tolerance activities should generally be funded from the core budget and performed by personnel on the permanent staff table.

At the workshop on Contemporary anti-Semitism the following concerns were raised: that anti-Semitism is not a Middle East issue, but a global issue; that the new types of anti-Semitism should be acknowledged; that fear and inability to talk about anti-Semitism is a key factor for its growth; that anti-Semitic incidents have become increasingly aimed at individuals through street violence and terror; that TV and the internet are used to spread anti-Semitic language; and that demographic development and inability to integrate immigrants in Europe will be a major challenge in the future. One participant noted that Islamic leaders should be encouraged to join interfaith bodies designed to foster dialogue.

At the end of the Conference the Chairman-in-Office summed up the proceedings of this Conference in what he called "Berlin Declaration". (see Annex 1)

Annex 1



**Bulgarian Chairmanship
The Chairman-in-Office**

Distinguished delegates,

Let me sum up the proceedings of this Conference in what I would like to call
“Berlin Declaration”.

Based on consultations I conclude that OSCE participating States,

Reaffirming the Universal Declaration on Human Rights, which proclaims that everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth therein, without distinction of any kind, such as race, religion or other status,

Recalling that Article 18 of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights and Article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights state that everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion,

Recalling also the decisions of the OSCE Ministerial Councils at Porto and Maastricht, as well as previous decisions and documents, and committing ourselves to intensify efforts to combat anti-Semitism in all its manifestations and to promote and strengthen tolerance and non-discrimination,

Recognizing that anti-Semitism, following its most devastating manifestation during the Holocaust, has assumed new forms and expressions, which, along with other forms of intolerance, pose a threat to democracy, the values of civilization and, therefore, to overall security in the OSCE region and beyond,

Concerned in particular that this hostility toward Jews -- as individuals or collectively -- on racial, social, and/or religious grounds, has manifested itself in verbal and physical attacks and in the desecration of synagogues and cemeteries,

1. Condemn without reserve all manifestations of anti-Semitism, and all other acts of intolerance, incitement, harassment or violence against persons or communities based on ethnic origin or religious belief, wherever they occur;

2. Also condemn all attacks motivated by anti-Semitism or by any other forms of religious or racial hatred or intolerance, including attacks against synagogues and other religious places, sites and shrines;

3. Declare unambiguously that international developments or political issues, including those in Israel or elsewhere in the Middle East, never justify anti-Semitism;

In addition, I note that the Maastricht Ministerial Council in its Decision on Tolerance and Non-Discrimination, tasked the Permanent Council “to further discuss ways and means of increasing the efforts of the OSCE and the participating States for the promotion of tolerance and non-discrimination in all fields.” In light of this Ministerial Decision, I welcome the April 22 Permanent Council Decision on Combating Anti-Semitism and, in accordance with that Decision, incorporate it into this Declaration.

1. The OSCE participating States commit to:
 - Strive to ensure that their legal systems foster a safe environment free from anti-Semitic harassment, violence or discrimination in all fields of life;
 - Promote, as appropriate, educational programmes for combating anti-Semitism;
 - Promote remembrance of and, as appropriate, education about the tragedy of the Holocaust, and the importance of respect for all ethnic and religious groups;
 - Combat hate crimes, which can be fuelled by racist, xenophobic and anti-Semitic propaganda in the media and on the Internet;
 - Encourage and support international organization and NGO efforts in these areas;
 - Collect and maintain reliable information and statistics about anti-Semitic crimes, and other hate crimes, committed within their territory, report such information periodically to the OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR), and make this information available to the public;
 - Endeavour to provide the ODIHR with the appropriate resources to accomplish the tasks agreed upon in the Maastricht Ministerial Decision on Tolerance and Non-Discrimination;
 - Work with the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly to determine appropriate ways to review periodically the problem of anti-Semitism;
 - Encourage development of informal exchanges among experts in appropriate fora on best practices and experiences in law enforcement and education;

2. To task the ODIHR to:
- Follow closely, in full co-operation with other OSCE institutions as well as the United Nations Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (UNCERD), the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI), the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC) and other relevant international institutions and NGOs, anti-Semitic incidents in the OSCE area making use of all reliable information available;
 - Report its findings to the Permanent Council and to the Human Dimension Implementation Meeting and make these findings public. These reports should also be taken into account in deciding on priorities for the work of the OSCE in the area of intolerance; and
 - Systematically collect and disseminate information throughout the OSCE area on best practices for preventing and responding to anti-Semitism and, if requested, offer advice to participating States in their efforts to fight anti-Semitism;

This Decision will be forwarded to the Ministerial Council for endorsement at its Twelfth Meeting.



**Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
Ministerial Council
Maastricht 2003**

MC.DEC/4/03
2 December 2003

Original: ENGLISH

2nd day of the Eleventh Meeting
MC(11) Journal No. 2, Agenda item 8

**DECISION No. 4/03
TOLERANCE AND NON-DISCRIMINATION**

The Ministerial Council,

Recognizing that respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, democracy and the rule of law are at the core of the OSCE's comprehensive concept of security,

Recalling its commitments in the field of the human dimension, enshrined in the Helsinki Final Act, the Charter of Paris for a New Europe, the Charter for European Security (Istanbul Summit, 1999) and all other relevant OSCE documents and decisions,

Recalling Decision No. 6 on Tolerance and Non-discrimination, adopted at the Tenth Meeting of the Ministerial Council in Porto on 7 December 2002,

Reaffirming its commitment to promote tolerance and combat discrimination, and its concern about all manifestations of aggressive nationalism, racism, chauvinism, xenophobia, anti-Semitism and violent extremism in all participating States, as well as discrimination based, *inter alia*, on race, colour, sex, language, religion or belief, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status,

Urging the relevant authorities in all participating States to continue to condemn publicly, at the appropriate level and in the appropriate manner, violent acts motivated by discrimination and intolerance,

Affirming its commitment to increase its efforts for the promotion of tolerance and non-discrimination in all fields,

Welcoming the work done by the OSCE during 2003,

1. Commits itself to promote the implementation of the Action Plan on Improving the Situation of Roma and Sinti within the OSCE Area;
2. Decides to enhance the efforts being made to increase women's participation and the role of women in furthering democratization and economic development, and to consider

integrating the provisions of the OSCE Action Plan on Gender Issues where applicable into national policies. Further decides to enhance its efforts to achieve gender balance at all levels within the OSCE, taking full account also in this respect of the principle of recruiting staff from all participating States on a fair basis. Reiterates that the OSCE encourages female candidates to apply for OSCE positions;

3. Decides to follow up the work started at the OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism, held in Vienna on 19 and 20 June 2003 and welcomes the offer by Germany to host a second OSCE conference on this subject in Berlin on 28 and 29 April 2004;

4. Decides to follow up the work started at the OSCE Conference on Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination, held in Vienna on 4 and 5 September 2003 and welcomes the offer by Belgium to host a second OSCE conference on this subject in Brussels in autumn 2004;

5. Tasks the Permanent Council to further discuss, in addition to the two above-mentioned conferences, ways and means of increasing the efforts of the OSCE and the participating States for the promotion of tolerance and non-discrimination in all fields;

6. Encourages all participating States to collect and keep records on reliable information and statistics on hate crimes, including on forms of violent manifestations of racism, xenophobia, discrimination, and anti-Semitism, as discussed and recommended in the above-mentioned conferences. Recognizing the importance of legislation to combat hate crimes, participating States will inform the ODIHR about existing legislation regarding crimes fuelled by intolerance and discrimination, and, where appropriate, seek the ODIHR's assistance in the drafting and review of such legislation;

7. Tasks the ODIHR, in full co-operation, *inter alia*, with the United Nations Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (UNCERD), the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) and the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC), as well as relevant NGOs, with serving as a collection point for information and statistics collected by participating States, and with reporting regularly on these issues, including in the format of the Human Dimension Implementation Meeting, as a basis for deciding on priorities for future work. The ODIHR will, *inter alia*, promote best practices and disseminate lessons learned in the fight against intolerance and discrimination;

8. Recognizes the need to combat hate crimes, which can be fuelled by racist, xenophobic, and anti-Semitic propaganda on the internet. We welcome the offer by France to host in Paris in 2004 a forward-looking event, fully respecting the rights to freedom of information and expression, on the relationship between propaganda on the internet and hate crimes;

9. Affirms the importance of freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief, and condemns all discrimination and violence, including against any religious group or individual believer. Commits to ensure and facilitate the freedom of the individual to profess and practice a religion or belief, alone or in community with others, where necessary through transparent and non-discriminatory laws, regulations, practices and policies. Encourages the participating States to seek the assistance of the ODIHR and its Panel of Experts on Freedom of Religion or Belief. Emphasizes the importance of a continued and strengthened interfaith and intercultural dialogue to promote greater tolerance, respect and mutual understanding;

10. Ensures the advancement of the implementation of the OSCE commitments on national minorities, and recognizes the importance of the recommendations of the High Commissioner on National Minorities on education, public participation, and language, including on its use in broadcast media, and the relevant recommendations of the Representative on Freedom of the Media in this regard;
11. Undertakes to combat discrimination against migrant workers. Further undertakes to facilitate the integration of migrant workers into the societies in which they are legally residing. Calls on the ODIHR to reinforce its activities in this respect;
12. Undertakes, in this context, to combat, subject to national legislation and international commitments, discrimination, where existing, against asylum seekers and refugees, and calls on the ODIHR to reinforce its activities in this respect;
13. Takes into account the UN Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement as a useful framework for the work of the OSCE and the endeavours of participating States in dealing with internal displacement;
14. Decides that the OSCE in addressing the issues contained in this document will increase its efforts towards the younger generation in order to build up their understanding of the need for tolerance. Human rights education merits particular attention;
15. Decides to intensify the co-operation of the OSCE with relevant international organizations such as the United Nations, the Council of Europe and the European Union, as well as with civil society and relevant non-governmental organizations to promote tolerance and non-discrimination;
16. Tasks the Permanent Council, the ODIHR, the HCNM and the RFoM, in close co-operation with the Chairmanship-in-Office, with ensuring an effective follow-up to the relevant provisions of the present decision, and requests the Permanent Council to address the operational and funding modalities for the implementation of this decision.

**Speech by the OSCE Chairman-in-Office Solomon Passy
at the opening of the OSCE Second Conference on Anti-
Semitism**

Berlin, 28-29 April 2004

Mr. President,
Excellencies,
Distinguished participants,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

The Jewish word for Holocaust is *Shoah*, which means *catastrophe*. The Holocaust was a catastrophe and a real tragedy not only for the Jewish people, but also for all mankind. Therefore, it is a great responsibility to keep alive the memory of the victims of the Holocaust as our homage to them and as a moral lesson for the future generations and politicians. If we let this memory fade away, we would become guilty of another crime. Because the murder of memory is the surest way to repeat the same mistakes. It is our moral duty not to forget and to keep speaking about the Holocaust as a prevention of new forms of genocide. I see in this direction the purpose of our conference.

I would like to start by pointing out that the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe was created and is called upon to ensure human security, or to protect and enhance peace and human rights. This by definition commits the OSCE to fight all forms of Anti-Semitism, this ancient and depressingly persistent manifestation of discrimination and intolerance.

The Bulgarian CIO has actively supported efforts to follow up the work started at the OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism, held in Vienna in June last year.

We believe it must be made clear not only that we take seriously the problem of Anti-Semitism and the concerns of Jewish communities and other minorities throughout the OSCE area, but that we are striving to implement the recommendations for concrete measures, to raise public awareness and to create “zero tolerance” towards all manifestations of intolerance.

As OSCE Chairmanship and as a country, we are deeply conscious of the fact that any form of racial, social or religious intolerance and hostility towards Jews

in particular strikes against the foundations of democracy. The way our countries respond to Anti-Semitism is critical for the credibility of democracy, and indeed for the future of our countries – diverse in culture and tradition, but united by our shared values.

Someone had said that when one minority is threatened, all minorities are threatened, and when all minorities are threatened – everybody is threatened .

Therefore, careful consideration of the manifestations of Anti-Semitism can benefit societies in determining how best to respond to other forms of racism and intolerance. Indeed, the OSCE is implementing a comprehensive approach in its efforts to fight discrimination and intolerance. Two more meetings to be held later this year in Paris and Brussels are devoted to this objective.

Here and now the focus is on Anti-Semitism, and not only because its older manifestations have lately intensified. It is also because of the concern caused by the contemporary forms of Anti-Semitism. Some of these are used as doctrinal justification for violence and terrorism. Others seek to exploit the dislocations caused by globalisation. We cannot ignore the new disguises of Anti-Semitism, if we wish to come up with an effective response.

And we should probably start with education. On the one hand, bias is learned in childhood, and on the other – the sense of guilt for the crimes of the Holocaust is waning, we strongly believe that we were right to make education a priority of the Bulgarian Chairmanship of the OSCE.

I would like to remind you of a Bulgarian suggestion to the Council of Europe a few years ago for a special lesson on the Holocaust on the same day and that all textbooks on history in the Member States should include a detailed chapter on the Holocaust, promoting positive examples like the ones in Bulgaria and in Denmark, while also highlighting the full horrors of that sinister chapter in the history of Europe. Such an initiative could be taken up in the OSCE framework.

By prioritising education in the whole OSCE area, we intend to focus on specific regional problems and to highlight issues of common interest. Anti-Semitism is clearly high on this agenda. Perhaps we should go further and promote specific educational programmes for fighting Anti-Semitism.

As for schools and training, I would like to quote the former French minister of education, Luc Ferry. Presenting a ten-point programme last year to deal with problems of Anti-Semitism and racism in schools, he said – and I quote:

“It is important to intervene at the slightest incident, even if it is verbal, and to let nothing of the sort pass in the schools without explanation and punishment.”

Yes, indeed, special importance has to be given to the promotion of educational programmes for combating Anti-Semitism and of education about the Holocaust and about respect for all ethnic and religious groups. Parallel to this, there should be a drive to combat hate crimes, fueled by racist, xenophobic and anti-Semitic propaganda in the media and on the Internet. The whole media industry has a special responsibility in this respect. We are aware that neither regulation nor self-regulation can be effective without the support of civil society. And therefore we should encourage and support the efforts of NGOs in all these areas.

If left unchallenged, manifestations of intolerance become more arrogant and aggressive. Our commitment to reinforcing common efforts to combat Anti-Semitism across the OSCE region should be directed towards fostering, through our legal and administrative systems, of a safe environment, free from harassment, violence or discrimination.

The commitment to combat Anti-Semitism has to be supported by systematic and reliable information and statistics about manifestations of Anti-Semitic and hate crimes. We have to gather and process this information and make it available to the public. The OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) has an important practical role to play in all this.

We would also like to highlight the importance of future work with the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly to determine appropriate ways to review periodically the problem of Anti-Semitism. Coordination between OSCE institutions and other international institutions and NGOs should be improved and enhanced.

We expect the implementation of the recommendations on the fight against Anti-Semitism, which would be an important outcome of this Conference to be further boosted by the next OSCE Ministerial Council in Sofia in December.

Speaking about Anti-Semitism always brings me back to my own country. The story of the rescue of nearly 50,000 Bulgarian Jews from certain death in the hands of the Nazis during World War II has been told already. I am very proud of that part of our history. Some may feel that the story should now be consigned to the historical archives. It is, however, my firm conviction that such an approach would be totally wrong.

Among many other unfortunate developments, the recent clashes in Kosovo have convinced me that the Bulgarian example needs to be brought back to memory again and again.

Last month's events in Kosovo – just 60 kilometres from our borders – represented a depressing reminder that ethnic and religious intolerance are far from dead, even in 21st century Europe.

The Bulgarian experience – put in brief in the secret notes of the Ambassador of the Third Reich to Sofia, Adolf-Heinz Beckerle, that the deportation of Bulgarian Jews is hampered by “the mentality of the Bulgarian people, who lack the ideological strength and have no inborn prejudice against Jews” – shows that mankind is capable of doing much better than that.

It is for political leaders to set the tone, but civil society, educationists and the media have a no less important role to play in this process. That should become even clearer after these two days of work devoted to the problems of Anti-Semitism. I wish all participants every success.

Thank you for your attention!

Annex 3

Distributed at the request of Germany

PC.DEL/342/04
29 April 2004

President of the Federal Republic of Germany

ENGLISH
Original: GERMAN

Opening Address
by Johannes Rau,
President of the Federal Republic of Germany,
at the OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism

Berlin, Wednesday, 28 April 2004

Translation of advance text

I.

I would like to begin by welcoming you all most warmly to Germany, and in particular to Berlin.

I am glad that the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe took Germany up on its offer to host the second conference on the subject of anti-Semitism.

Some people will surely ask: why the OSCE? There are in fact good reasons for its involvement. The Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe was the first security organization to recognize the inherent link between international security and human rights. The protection of our common values is inseparable from our security. The German Basic Law also reflects this view.

The Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe sees itself as a standard-setting body, whose key tasks include promoting respect for human rights. At its meeting in Maastricht last December, the OSCE Ministerial Council reaffirmed that fostering tolerance and non-discrimination remains a focus of its work.

That was a wise decision. Since 1975, the Conference and later the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe have worked hard and achieved a great deal in the promotion of human rights. But much remains to be done: the high standards that the participating States have set themselves for guaranteeing human rights and the rights of minorities are not universally met.

II.

The subject of today's conference, anti-Semitism, is a cause for concern. The fact that a conference is needed on this subject in the year 2004, a conference which is examining current problems rather than historical issues, is not a good sign.

Many people who, like myself, personally experienced the Nazi era, wished and hoped back then that when those horrendous years of war and genocide were over, xenophobia and anti-Semitism would no longer have any place in the world.

World history did not however take the course we wanted after 1945. Horrific wars have been waged in many parts of the world – and still are today.

The Shoah was not the final genocide. This month marked the tenth anniversary of the genocide in Rwanda, which claimed the lives of 800,000 people. The international community did not intervene. Today most people agree that the community of States and the United Nations failed to live up to their responsibilities. This must not happen again.

We have had to accept that after World War II, racism, xenophobia and anti-Semitism did not disappear from the face of the world, nor from Europe –neither western nor eastern Europe. Nor have they vanished from the country where, seventy years ago, the annihilation of the European Jews was systematically planned and executed. I am of course referring to Germany.

But we also know that the situation in Germany and Europe today differs fundamentally from the situation in the 1930s and 40s. It also differs from the reality in Europe during the Cold War, which divided our continent for four long decades.

How great was our joy when, in 1989 and 1990, this division was healed in peace! How great were people's hopes once again! This mood was also reflected in the Charter of Paris for a new Europe.

This document of hope contains, under the heading "Guidelines for the Future", the following words: "We express our determination to combat all forms of racial and ethnic hatred, anti-Semitism, xenophobia and discrimination against anyone as well as persecution on religious and ideological grounds."

The Europe of today is certainly not the Europe of the 30s and 40s. Back then the state, the German state, was the source of the barbarity.

Many States did nothing to stop this barbarity or did too little for those who were forced to flee it. This does not relativize the crimes of Nazi Germany. But it does underline the huge difference between then and now. Today barbarity is firmly opposed not just in Germany but throughout Europe and beyond by the State and by whole communities of nations. Europe is a community of values which is based on "principles of liberty, democracy and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms and of the rule of law," to quote the European Union's Treaty of Amsterdam.

These values are also recognized by all other participating States of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. That is why we must – each in his own country and all of us together – ensure that nationalism, racism, xenophobia and anti-Semitism do not poison life in our countries.

This goal is also shared by the Conference we are opening today.

III.

This Conference is – like last year's Vienna Conference on Anti-Semitism, also a response to recent debates: debates on whether anti-Semitism has increased and is increasing in Europe and whether a "new" type of anti-Semitism is spreading across Europe.

Interesting, informative and sophisticated contributions have been made to these debates. Some contributors have however been far from objective. They have replaced facts with prejudice. Their statements are not just inaccurate, they are dangerous. It is my firm conviction that we can only successfully counter anti-Semitism if we avoid blanket judgements of all kinds and always take a careful look at what the situation is really like in the States of the European Union and the OSCE.

Nobody should close their eyes to racism, xenophobia or anti-Semitism. We should however only use these terms when they really fit the case. Two things are needed: special vigilance and special care. If we do not think before we speak we will do injury to one of our prime goals: the goal of raising awareness and honing the perceptions of people in all our countries as regards the different forms of racism and anti-Semitism.

It is not enough to denounce attitudes and statements as "racist" or "anti-Semitic". I believe it is vital for us to publicly discuss racist and anti-Semitic prejudices and to challenge their substance. Otherwise some people will be given the impression that we want to suppress all debate on the substance of such statements. And that is precisely the impression that anti-Semites and racists around the world, throughout history, have wished to create.

I am often reminded that many people do not distinguish sufficiently between anti-Semitism and xenophobia on the one hand, and normal criticism on the other. Everyone should know that criticism of Jews or Jewish institutions is just as permissible as criticism of any other citizens or any other institutions in a free country.

Of course we know that criticism of Jews or Jewish institutions often comes from people who have deeply ingrained anti-Semitic prejudices. These are frequently revealed by the language they use. They talk of Jews as if they were all the same. They contrast "the" Jews with "the" Germans or "the" French; they blame the whole Jewish community for the misconduct of a single individual.

But we also know that there are other people who criticize individual Jews for their misconduct, because what is wrong for one person cannot be right for another. Such criticism can be recognized, for example, by the way it focuses on the actions of the person and not on his or her origins. It can also be identified by the fact that the whole Jewish community is not made liable for the conduct of the individual.

IV.

The Middle East conflict and the policies of the Israeli Government have played an important role in the most recent debates on anti-Semitism. We all know that virulent anti-Semitism has been behind some of the criticism levelled at the policies of the Israeli Government over the past decades. Here too we must exercise special vigilance and special care.

Such criticism has come from individuals, but unfortunately also from States and the community of States: it was certainly one of the darkest hours of the United Nations when, on

10 November 1975, the General Assembly in resolution 3379 equated Zionism with racism and racial discrimination. It took more than sixteen years for this resolution to be revoked.

Such occurrences do not however give anyone the right to discredit all criticism of any particular Israeli Government as invariably anti-Semitic.

I know many friends of Israel who criticize Israeli policies vis-à-vis the Palestinians because they are deeply concerned about the State of Israel and Israeli society. They share this attitude with Israelis who strongly criticize the policies of their Government. Such Israelis are not only to be found in the Opposition. Political differences of opinion have to be tolerated. Friends even have a right to know what one really thinks of their actions. But, I would like to add, this must not always be done publicly.

I have also appealed time and again to all critics of Israeli policy to take into consideration the special situation there. Many people live in Israel who themselves or whose parents fled the horror of the Shoah in the hope of finally finding a new, safe home. Imagine how afraid many of them must now be of the car bombs and the suicide attacks on them and their fellow citizens.

Ever since the State was founded, the people of Israel have lived in a state of existential siege. However, while we should try to imagine ourselves in their shoes, this does not mean that we have to refrain from all criticism, perhaps even strong criticism, but we should, in my opinion, endeavour to formulate it in a reasonable way.

I believe that we must talk much more about this and other important differences in public. Only in this way can we prevent old stereotypes from becoming yet more deeply entrenched or even worse, new ones from forming. This we owe first and foremost to all those who have been the target and victim of racist and anti-Semitic animosity, humiliation and violence – today and in the past.

V.

To combat all forms of racism and anti-Semitism and punish the perpetrators of violence we must bring to bear the full force of the law, for the sake of peace within our societies. For we know that every attack on minorities is also an attack on our whole society, which is built on tolerance, pluralism and the law.

The humanity of any society and of any community of States is revealed in its treatment of the minorities and vulnerable groups who live within its borders. Attacks target individual people and institutions, but in reality are designed to destroy the values and trust on which coexistence is based.

The vast majority of people in the States of the European Union and the OSCE are aware of this, as the past years have made clear. Wherever anti-Semitic or racist attacks have taken place, widespread solidarity has as a rule been expressed for the victims – there have even been mass demonstrations. The vast majority of people in Europe reject anti-Semitism and xenophobia and indeed many do so publicly.

Given the centuries-long history of Christian-inspired anti-Judaism and of anti-Semitism throughout Europe, this marks a great and hard-won step forward. Innumerable people and

institutions worked to achieve this: women and men in positions of responsibility in science and politics, members of the Church and trade unions, teachers and educators.

They have all done their bit to ensure that mutual respect and tolerance of people of different ethnic origins, religious faiths and cultural traditions are now firmly embedded in our societies.

Experience shows that it is not enough to enshrine human rights and dignity in constitutions and laws. These values must be expounded again and again, and justified, communicated and taught by way of example to each new generation. Now and again they have to be fought for anew, they have to be reclaimed. This calls for the dedication of as many citizens as possible.

And we need yet more: we need civil courage. More civil courage. Nobody should look the other way when they witness violence against people whose skin is a different colour, who have different religious or political beliefs, who suffer from some form of disability.

That is why I expressly welcome the OSCE's initiative advancing practical proposals for combating racism and anti-Semitism with deeds rather than resolutions. This is a task that we have to tackle – regardless of whether racism and anti-Semitism have increased in Europe or not.

This is not just a task for the governments. For this reason, I am particularly glad that so many non-governmental organizations are attending the Conference.

VI.

The Conference will discuss what individual States can do to counter anti-Semitism, and what they can do together. It will look at ways and means of promoting inter-faith and intercultural dialogue. It will focus on tolerance through education. These are all important contributions to the fight against racism and anti-Semitism.

One segment will be devoted to the role of the media and the Internet. I feel that this is especially important. The Internet has unfortunately become a new medium for the dissemination of extremist propaganda. It has also become a platform for hate mongering and a breeding ground for politically motivated violence.

Human dignity, human rights and fundamental rights also apply to the modern information and communication technologies. States and politicians are called upon to act, as are all forces in society: messages that violate the law if printed or broadcast are not somehow legal because they are published online. Political leaders must act to solve this problem.

I hope that this Conference will advance the debate on these issues, too. But above all I hope that it will point the way to a world in which nobody needs to be afraid because they look different from the majority, come from somewhere else than the majority or follow a different faith from the majority.

Let us work together for a world in which we can all be different without being afraid.

I hope that your debates are fruitful, your conversations interesting and that the Conference produces some promising results.

FONDATION POUR LA MEMOIRE DE LA SHOAH

Discours de Madame Simone Veil
Conférence sur l'antisémitisme
Berlin 28-29 avril 2004

PC.NGO/7/04
29 April 2004

FRENCH only

Monsieur le Président de la république fédérale d'Allemagne, Excellence,
Mesdames et Messieurs,

L'antisémitisme européen est une affaire trop grave pour être livrée à l'affabulation, à la caricature, voire à la moindre inexactitude. L'ambition que je me suis fixée n'est pas de vous dire les paroles que vous attendez, ni de celles qui inquiètent avec désinvolture, ni de celles qui rassurent avec légèreté, mais simplement, autant qu'il est possible, de dire ce qui est, et de ne pas me dérober à la rude vérité des faits.

Je parlerai plus particulièrement de la France parce que je n'ignore pas que mon pays est souvent plus particulièrement visé. Il est vrai, au demeurant, que c'est en France, que se trouve la plus grande Diaspora, après les Etats Unis, avec les mêmes inquiétudes que celles qui sont à l'origine de cette conférence. Que se passe-t-il en France? Il n'est pas douteux qu'aujourd'hui, les Juifs de France sont inquiets, et que certains ont peur. Les agressions physiques et verbales, je ne dirai pas qu'elles sont devenues banales, mais il est vrai qu'elles ne

surprennent plus. Il fut un temps, qui n'est pas si lointain, où un seul des actes qui à présent sont commis par centaines contre les juifs de France, aurait suscité l'indignation immédiate, collective, voire unanime, de la société française. Il fut un temps où il n'aurait pas été imaginable qu'un enfant juif d'un grand lycée parisien, dût, comme c'est arrivé cette année, changer d'établissement pour échapper aux brimades, aux intimidations et aux insultes.

Ce temps n'est plus : c'est un fait. Il n'est pas exceptionnel, qu'aujourd'hui, sur le sol de la République française, un juif ait à souffrir de ce qu'il est. Cette réalité, je ne crois pas vous l'apprendre. Il est de moins en moins indifférent d'être juif en France, il est de moins en moins anodin de porter un nom juif, de porter une kippa, ou d'arborer, en guise de bijou, une lettre hébraïque. Les plus jeunes, notamment, ont à subir cette alliance de l'ignorance, de la mode et de la force. Ils ont, chaque jour davantage, à répondre du fait qu'ils sont juifs. Je n'ai pas le dessein de vous émouvoir, mais simplement celui de vous informer. Je vous épargne donc les anecdotes. Sachez seulement qu'elles sont assez nombreuses pour n'être plus anecdotiques.

Mais il est vrai aussi qu'il serait, injuste, et, d'une certaine manière, malhonnête, d'exagérer l'importance de cette peur. Ne faisons pas aux victimes des persécutions passées l'outrage de comparer, même indirectement, même par allusion, ce qu'elles ont vécu avec ce qui arrive aujourd'hui aux juifs de France.

Quand, Présidente de la Fondation pour la mémoire de la Shoah, j'entends parler, à propos de la France des années 2000, de « *Nuit de cristal* », ce n'est pas seulement l'honneur de mon pays que je suis obligée de défendre, c'est le respect de la mémoire des victimes. Et c'est aussi la vérité.

La vérité, dont il faut être conscient, c'est que la France traverse une vague d'antisémitisme. La vérité, c'est aussi que cette vague n'est à aucun degré, à aucun titre, comparable avec la déferlante de haine, qui, il y a soixante ans, envoya à la mort soixante seize mille juifs de France.

D'abord, aujourd'hui, en France, l'Etat est là, pour garantir la sécurité des juifs. Si vous cherchez des pays antisémites, vous en trouverez, hélas, un certain nombre sur la Terre. Mais, je vous le dis avec solennité, la France n'en fait pas partie. Les juifs y sont chez eux, citoyens comme les autres, la devise de la République est la leur, et s'ils dénoncent, avec irritation, avec impatience, parfois avec angoisse, les agressions dont ils sont victimes, c'est par confiance, et non pas par défiance, envers leur pays.

Cette confiance, qui va jusqu'à la tendresse, entre les juifs de France et la République française, elle est d'abord le fruit de l'histoire. L'histoire des juifs de France, c'est—celle d'une heureuse rencontre, d'un amour souvent blessé, souvent offensé, souvent humilié, entre le vieux peuple de l'Antiquité et le pays qui sut l'accueillir et recevoir la richesse de son apport spirituel, intellectuel, et

moral. C'est en France, et non pas ailleurs en Europe, qu'on accorda d'abord aux juifs le statut de citoyens, c'est en France qu'ils connurent d'abord la dignité de l'existence libre, c'est en France que fut proclamée, avec les droits de l'Homme, la liberté de « toutes les opinions, même religieuses ». La reconnaissance que les Français d'origine ou de confession juive ont, dès lors, vouée à leur patrie, et qui amena l'un d'entre eux à proclamer que la Terre promise, c'était la France, et que Jérusalem, c'était Paris, cette reconnaissance, ils l'éprouvent toujours, parce qu'ils savent que toute mémoire est un héritage, et tout héritage, une gratitude.

De cette mémoire commune, de l'histoire si tourmentée de cette harmonie réciproque, il est un autre moment, « un moment de la conscience humaine », que je tiens à évoquer devant vous, et c'est bien entendu l'Affaire Dreyfus.

Pour tout juif français, c'est, encore aujourd'hui, un triple symbole.

Le symbole, d'abord, de l'injustice réparée. C'est en voyant, dans la cour de l'Ecole militaire, arracher les épaulettes de cet homme pâle qui criait : « je suis innocent ! », qu'un journaliste juif viennois eut l'intuition que les juifs ne pourraient accéder à la fierté de la libre souveraineté que le jour où ils disposeraient d'une patrie qui porte le nom de leur peuple.

Le symbole, ensuite, des deux France. Il est des moments, rares et précieux, dans l'histoire d'un pays, où il est permis de savoir avec certitude où est le bien et où est le mal. Pendant les douze années de l'affaire Dreyfus, une France s'est

constituée, qui demeure celle à laquelle nous avons la fierté d'appartenir, celle d'Emile Zola et de Jean Jaurès, celle de ceux pour qui ni la gloire, ni la force, ni la raison d'Etat ne justifient la condamnation d'un innocent et l'acquittement d'un coupable, celle de ceux pour qui l'honneur est une chose simple. Et c'est cette France-là, que j'appellerai la France du scrupule, qui l'a emporté.

C'est pourquoi Dreyfus, c'est finalement le symbole de la justice affirmée, le symbole de cette France dont Emmanuel Levinas entendit dire, de la bouche de son père, à l'heure des pogroms qui ravageaient une Russie indifférente : « Un pays où l'on se déchire sur le sort d'un petit capitaine juif est un pays où nous devons aller sans attendre ».

L'histoire n'excuse rien, mais elle explique presque tout. C'est elle, à n'en pas douter, qui explique à la fois la confiance des juifs de France, et la vigilance des pouvoirs publics. Car les pouvoirs publics, dans la République française, ont pris toute la mesure du phénomène. Ils n'ont pas seulement entrepris de rassurer les juifs, ils s'emploient à les défendre et à les protéger. Je peux vous le dire avec gravité, car rien, en la matière, n'est pis que la calomnie : la République française veille sur ses juifs. Nous avons entendu le président de la République proclamer qu'agresser un juif de France, c'est agresser la France. Nous l'avons vu mettre en place un comité interministériel de lutte contre l'antisémitisme. Nous avons entendu l'ambassadeur d'Israël en France déclarer que la France

était le seul pays d'Europe à avoir pris des mesures concrètes pour lutter contre la haine antisémite.

Si la France d'aujourd'hui n'est pas comparable à celle d'il y a soixante ans, s'il n'est plus possible de seulement concevoir, dans notre pays, un antisémitisme affiché, officiel, soutenu par une idéologie à prétention scientifique, ce n'est pas seulement à cause de la détermination des pouvoirs publics. C'est d'abord pour deux raisons, du reste indissociables l'une de l'autre.

La première, c'est évidemment la Shoah. Il est des chiffres, des récits, des photographies, après lesquels il est plus difficile de haïr, et plus difficile encore d'exprimer sa haine. C'est pourquoi la mémoire de la Shoah n'est pas seulement une obligation de respect et de fidélité envers les morts, mais un devoir de vigilance envers les vivants. La seule façon d'agir pour que les juifs ne risquent pas de mourir à nouveau dans les chambres à gaz, c'est de se souvenir qu'ils y sont allés. Parmi les véritables menaces antisémites qui pèsent sur la France d'aujourd'hui, il en est deux dont je tiens à souligner l'importance et la gravité. Le négationnisme, d'abord : l'antisémitisme s'est toujours nourri de fables et de mensonges. Voilà la nouvelle fable, et le nouveau mensonge. Non seulement c'est une forme d'antisémitisme, mais c'est peut-être la forme moderne de l'antisémitisme qui dit non pas : « Mort aux juifs », mais : « les juifs ne sont pas morts ». Il est insupportable, voire douloureux de devoir se battre pour prouver que ces six millions de juifs n'ont pas succombé à une mort naturelle.

Et puis il est un autre danger, moins spectaculaire, moins apparent, plus insidieux, et donc beaucoup plus grave. Ce danger, je l'exprime devant vous en mesurant la gravité des mots que je prononce : il est de plus en plus difficile d'enseigner l'histoire du génocide dans les écoles et dans les lycées de France. Un phénomène s'y développe, que des intellectuels ont appelé « la concurrence des victimes ». Ainsi, certains enfants, souvent mal intégrés dans la communauté française et en recherche de leur propre identité, n'acceptent pas la place que les manuels scolaires accordent à la Shoah. Certains professeurs, pour éviter les incidents, cèdent ou renoncent spontanément à traiter de la Shoah devant une classe.

Si cela devait se confirmer ou s'aggraver, la Mémoire, premier rempart contre l'antisémitisme, s'effondrerait.

Seul resterait le second : l'amitié que désormais les autorités chrétiennes portent à la communauté juive. Cette amitié atteste, par l'exemple, qu'aucun malentendu, fût-il millénaire, fût-il criminel, ne résiste aux assauts du cœur et de la volonté. Ceux qui luttent contre la haine peuvent se garder de tout fatalisme : il ne faut pas regarder l'antisémitisme comme une rage sans cause, contre laquelle il faudrait simplement se défendre sans chercher à la réduire.

L'antisémitisme a eu, pendant vingt siècles, une cause directe et précise : on enseignait, dans tous les catéchismes du monde, que les juifs avaient tué Jésus. Les enfants chrétiens apprennent à présent que Jésus était un juif, crucifié, comme tant d'autres juifs, par les Romains. C'est un changement considérable,

un bouleversement de la conscience occidentale, que Vatican II a consacré. Les juifs de France sont reconnaissants à l'Eglise de France dont ils ont entendu l'hommage continu, fait de repentir et de gratitude, que, depuis quinze ans, elle rend au judaïsme. Aussi je souhaite que la diffusion du film de Mel Gibson ne réveille pas les accusations que l'on croyait définitivement récusées par les plus hautes autorités de l'église.

L'antisémitisme français a perdu ses racines. Il est privé d'un grand nombre de ses thèmes traditionnels. Et pourtant, aujourd'hui, à une autre échelle, sur d'autres terrains, il renaît. Pourquoi ?

Permettez-moi de dire ce que chacun sait. La vague d'antisémitisme dont souffre aujourd'hui la France date, très exactement, du début de ce qu'il est convenu d'appeler la «seconde Intifada». De jeunes Français, privés d'identité et de valeurs, empruntent celles des autres, et s'identifient à la lutte palestinienne. L'ennemi, à leurs yeux, ce sont les juifs, parce qu'ils sont totalement assimilés à la société française dont ils se sentent eux-même exclus, ou parce que les juifs leur paraissent soutenir inconditionnellement la politique israélienne.

Je ne veux pas commettre l'erreur de l'approximation, encore moins l'injustice de la généralisation. Disons simplement que la cause de l'antisémitisme nouveau est un antisionisme exacerbé, sans nuance et fondé sur l'ignorance. Les juifs de France sont, le plus souvent malgré eux, amenés à se justifier, à s'expliquer sur leur attachement à un pays, où souvent une partie de leur famille, victime de

persécutions, a trouvé refuge, et où, pour la première fois, depuis deux mille ans, on peut parler hébreu sans se faire massacrer.

Je poserai, pour conclure, la question que nous nous posons tous : comment mettre fin à cette recrudescence de l'antisémitisme ? D'abord, en choisissant de renforcer le modèle républicain plutôt que d'importer le conflit proche-oriental. Ensuite, en étant juste. C'est-à-dire en parlant de la République française avec la reconnaissance que lui doivent tous ceux qui ont appris à aimer d'elle ses valeurs et son langage de liberté : valeurs de tolérance mais aussi de fermeté à l'égard de ceux qui les bafouent, et de fraternité envers ceux qui les respectent.

Monsieur le Président, Mesdames et Messieurs,

Je fais confiance à l'OSCE pour renforcer une législation que la France, pour sa part, a déjà mise en place, et pour nous guider et combattre un fléau dont mieux que beaucoup, je sais vers quelles atrocités et vers quelle barbarie il peut mener. Je souhaite que vos travaux permettent de redonner tout son sens au mot « fraternité » .

PC.DEL/345/04
29 April 2004

ENGLISH
Original: GERMAN

**WORDS OF GREETING ON THE OCCASION OF THE OSCE
CONFERENCE ON THE SUBJECT OF ANTI-SEMITISM IN EUROPE
FROM DR. PAUL SPIEGEL, PRESIDENT OF THE CENTRAL
COUNCIL OF JEWS IN GERMANY**

Berlin, 28 April 2004

The growing prevalence of anti-Semitism in Europe is at last being discussed by a wider public. The Jewish community in Germany has noted with satisfaction that the initiative leading to the present OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism was taken by the German Minister for Foreign Affairs. This is also a welcome and important signal of solidarity with Jews throughout the world.

The Middle East conflict, which unfortunately continues to smoulder with undiminished intensity, and the continuing unstable situation in Iraq have further heightened the danger of new terrorist atrocities, like the recent one in Madrid. At the same time, an increase in acts of violence motivated by anti-Semitism and in verbal attacks and insults directed against Jews can be observed within the European community of States. These alarming facts call for extreme vigilance not only on the part of the security authorities but also of the population in many countries around the world.

The unavoidable concentration on Islamic terrorist attacks and acts of violence often has the result that anti-Semitic activities, assaults and abuse by skinheads and radical right-wing groups and individuals are frequently mentioned only in passing in the media and are barely noticed by the public. It must be clearly stated in this regard that one cannot speak of more dangerous and less dangerous anti-Semitism. Nor can certain forms of anti-Semitism be treated more tolerantly than others. Criticism of Israel with an anti-Semitic colour from supposed intellectuals is just as unacceptable as the inflammatory slogans of bawling right-wing extremists or violent, fanaticized Islamists. And the Islamist danger should not be given excessive emphasis. The fatal result would be an increase in anti-*Islamism* within the European Union (EU). The first signs of this are already evident. Such tendencies must be a matter of equal concern to us, because they threaten the peaceful coexistence of cultures, ethnic groups and religions in Europe.

Moreover, it makes no difference in the end from the point of view of the many victims of extremists — victims who usually receive little attention — whether the perpetrators of violent acts or the senders of threatening hate letters are Islamists or European right-wing radicals. Threats of violence, assaults, day-to-day discrimination and scrawled insults on overturned gravestones of relatives and friends are frightening and humiliating for any one, whatever his or her faith or origin. This is particularly so as every incident of this kind makes clear to us Jews that we are still threatened in Europe, or again threatened,

directly or indirectly, nearly 60 years after the end of the Holocaust. Not many people realize what it means to have to live with this sensation. One has the impression that, in the eyes of many non-Jews, subjection to a certain degree of threat is already a permanent feature of Jewish existence. This is a cynical view which has nothing to do with the experience of many Jews in Europe of a diminished feeling of security. We fear violence and suffer under discrimination like any one else. However, this fear does not paralyse us. We shall continue untiringly to denounce and strongly condemn anti-Semitic and radical right-wing tendencies.

With the entry of eight eastern European countries into the EU, due on 1 May 2004, the sufferings of these countries under communist and National Socialist occupation — something of which little is known in western Europe — will increasingly move into the consciousness of Europeans. Simultaneously, these States will be increasingly confronted with their history in regard to collaboration in crimes, particularly under National Socialist occupation — a history which they have only begun to deal with. For the expanded Europe, this will mean, in the future, tackling more intensively a traditional anti-Semitism which is still widespread in many eastern European countries. The combating of all forms of anti-Semitism in Europe may, as a result, become a more complicated, more difficult and more time-consuming process than has generally been assumed up to now. We should prepare ourselves for this in good time.

In the framework of this Conference, the phenomenon of European anti-Semitism will be thoroughly discussed from different perspectives and the attention of the public will be drawn to this subject. “At last”, I should like to add! An excellent result would be for the participants to succeed in setting in motion initiatives against right-wing and Islamic radicalism that transcend national boundaries and in agreeing on regular evaluations and follow-up meetings.

The message must go out from Berlin that the countries of Europe are united in the resolute proscription of all forms of anti-Semitism and racism. In this connection, I should like to take advantage of this forum to thank and commend all those men and women of goodwill who show solidarity with Jews everywhere in the world, who speak out firmly against anti-Semitism and who give us encouragement. I am speaking of private initiatives, organizations and honest men and women in a wide variety of functions who understand our fears and concerns, take a clear position and understand what anti-Semitism really is: a way of thinking that is contemptuous of human dignity and a danger for any democracy based on the rule of law.

I therefore appeal to the people of Europe: remember that you or your relatives could be the next victim! Do not allow yourselves to be intimidated, and firmly oppose every form of discrimination, right-wing radicalism and terrorism.

OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism
Berlin, 28-29 April 2004

PC.DEL/344/04
29 April 2004

Keynote Speech 28.4.2004
Max Jakobson
Finland

ENGLISH only

Suddenly, this year anti-Semitism has become a prime topic in Europe. Two months ago, the newly-founded Transnational Institute was the forum of a lively debate on anti-Semitism in Brussels; a week later the EU Commission held a seminar on the same subject. And now we have this high-level conference - nothing like it has been arranged before.

Seminars and conferences serve politicians, officials, intellectuals - a wider public is reached by movies, Mel Gibson's film "The Passion of the Christ" is seen by millions. I believe every Jew - every Jew of my age - has at some point in his life been challenged by the Gibson story.

I remember how at the age of seven I one day came home from school with a bloody nose, having had a fight with a boy who claimed that my father had killed Christ. And what did you answer - my parents asked. I answered: My father is not that old.

Today, anti-Semitism in Europe - or within the European Union - has less to do with religion. The position of Jews in today's European society is of course fundamentally different from what it was before and during World War II. Anti-Semitism persists, but its character has changed.

One example of the change in attitudes toward Jews has not often been mentioned. I refer to the role of Jews in military service. In my youth Jews were held in contempt because it was believed that they were no good as soldiers. According to a bitter joke, this was the only opinion shared by Truman and Stalin. Both were astonished to learn that the Jews were able to defend their new-born state in 1948. But today it's reversed, the Jewish soldiers of the Israeli army are accused of being too tough, too brutal, in dealing with the Palestinians.

To criticise Prime Minister Ariel Sharon's policy is of course not anti-Semitism. The Prime Minister faces opposition in his own country, and in Europe and America many prominent Jews condemn his strategy. Yet some of the criticism reflects an anti-Zionism, calling into question Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state. In the late 1960's and 1970's the European radical left regarded anti-Zionism as part of anti colonialism. Israel was labelled an outpost of imperial America. Anti-Zionism merged with anti-Americanism. Some of these views still exist.

The anti-Israel view that prevails in most European Countries, combined with a softer attitude toward the Palestinians, does have an indirect effect on European Jewry in two ways.

Among Europeans considered well informed on international affairs, Jews are believed to be pulling strings behind the scenes in Washington. When the former Malaysian Prime Minister Mahathir declared that "the Jews rule this world by proxy", Europeans of course rejected his claim: the Jews do not rule the world. But do they rule the United States?

No doubt the intellectual power of American Jewry is considerable, reminding us Europeans of the migration to the United States of European intellectuals fleeing Nazi and Fascist tyranny and causing a transatlantic shift in the granting of Nobel-prizes. Although there is not a single Jew in the present American cabinet, some Jewish politicians and writers can be said to have influence on the American policy. But there are other Jews who strongly oppose it, as any reader of the New York Times or the New York Review of Books can testify. To imagine that US policy is guided by a secret Jewish cabal is simply a myth - one as old as the "Protocols of the Elders of Zion" forged over a century ago by the tsarist secret police.

Europeans remember the Protocols as a bizarre relic from the distant past, but in the Islamic world its Arabic version is today a best seller. A report on the Palestinian resistance movement Hamas recently issued by the International Crises Group is revealing: "The Protocols of the Elders of Zion is approvingly cited (in the Hamas charter) as a basis on which Hamas holds the Zionism movement and the Jews in general responsible for every real or perceived ill to have afflicted the modern world, including capitalism and communism, both world wars, the UN Security Council and the drug trade ---" etc.

Hamas, which is supported by one fifth of the Palestinian people, is officially committed to the destruction of Israel and the establishment of an Islamic state throughout Palestine. How to persuade Hamas to join the peace process is discussed by ICG in a 34-page report. My point is that this is not just a local matter. The anti-Jewish world view described in the Hamas Charter is widely shared throughout the Islamic world. It is used to justify terrorist attacks against Israel, as well as Western targets.

Thus a virulent type of anti-Semitism is brought to Western Europe by Muslim immigrants. Of course only a small number of immigrants are guilty of violent acts against Jews, but understandably governments fear that violence will increase as long as the conflict between Israel and the Palestinians continues to remain unsolved.

Thus, the combination of several factors creates the gap between Western Europe and the United States with regard to Israel: Western Europe facing a large Muslim immigration is anxious to settle the conflict between Israel and the Palestinians. The US looks upon Israel as an ally in its war on terrorism and accepts the Sharon view that the Palestinian side is at present incapable of negotiating a peace agreement. The Jews of Europe feel squeezed between the two powers.

This is the background to President Jacques Chirac's recent significant public gesture. By inviting the President of Israel to a state visit - the first Israeli head of state to receive such an invitation in 17 years - he created great relief among the 600 000 members of the Jewish Community in France - the largest in Europe and third largest in the world. It was an important step toward collective European action against the new type of anti-Semitism threatening the Jewish communities.

OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism
Berlin, 28 – 29 April 2004

PC.NGO/14/04
7 May 2004

ENGLISH only

Keynote Statement

European conference on antisemitism

Memory as warning

- by Elie Wiesel -

Berlin 2004

That this conference takes place in Berlin is of great symbolic importance. Once upon a time, when I and the world were younger, gigantic meetings were being held here for anti-Semitism; now we have assembled here to oppose anti-Semitism.

There is no capital, no city in the world where this conference is more meaningful and more compelling.

After the war I naïvely thought that, for years and years to come, whenever a Jew would be seen anywhere in Europe, he or she would be carried on people's shoulders and enveloped by everyone with so much tenderness and affection that he or she would at last feel secure and welcome.

Had any pessimist told me then that, in my lifetime, I will hear stories of Jews in Berlin or Paris being advised by friends not to wear a kipah in the street, so as not to attract hostility and peril, I would not have believed it.

But it now has become reality.

There are too many cities in the world plagued by vocal and violent hatred towards the Jewish people. Profanations of Jewish monuments, Jewish cemeteries desecrated, synagogues vandalized or burned, violent anti-Jewish incidents, extreme left wing banners unashamedly slandering Israel and comparing Sharon to Hitler, mass incitement to hysterical violence disguised as anti-Israeli propaganda, shrieking voices in a variety of languages "Kill the Jews, death to the Jews", anyone

expressing solidarity with victims of terrorism in Israel being scandalously branded as anti-Arab: these are frequent if not daily occurrences. Particularly contemptuous are efforts by antisemites or pseudo-antisemites, from the extreme right or the extreme left, to usurp Holocaust language and place it in the context of the Middle Eastern conflict. For a time, the fanatics among them used to deny the Holocaust. Now they move in a different direction, with a different objective. They say: Jews are now doing to Palestinians what the Nazis have done to them. The Jew in me finds this repulsive and outrageous. For in a way, this is an attempt to exculpate the guilty who now could say: What do you want from us? They, the Jews are not different from the worst among us... Well what does all this mean? It simply means that, as a social disease, theological scandal and political perversion, antisemitism is clearly on the rise in so many, too many parts in Europe, but not only in Europe.

The Jew I am belongs to a traumatized generation that has witnessed and endured antisemitism in its apocalyptic expression. As such we have antennas, better yet: we are antennas. And if we tell you that the signals we receive are disturbing, indeed alarming, people better listen.

But Berlin is special. If the roots of anti-Semitism were everywhere more or less the same, its ultimate consequences in this place were singular, sui generis, unequalled and unprecedented, for they made the plague of Jew-hatred grow to calculated yet unimaginable cruelty. It is here that it initiated a State sponsored program aimed at wiping the last Jew off the surface of the earth. It is here that the anti-Semite hated me even before I was born.

Granted, what we so poorly and hesitantly call Shoa or the Holocaust had many ingredients. But no one will deny that it would not have taken place had anti-Semitism not been its driving force.

If in other countries, good people could remain passive when anti-Semitic propaganda was flourishing, claiming that they did not know what its outcome would be, today, in Berlin, no decent person would invoke such argument of ignorance for his or her silence. Today they know, today everyone knows.

We know where it comes from and where it is heading, where it leads its victims. It leads them to isolation, exclusion, condemnation—and worse. But we also know that anti-Semitism is dangerous not only to Jews but to countries too, where it is allowed to flourish. How did Kafka phrased it? When a Jew is slapped in the face, humankind itself falls to the ground. Take its newest phase: suicide killing that used to wound Israel is now affecting the whole world.

Antisemitism is rooted in hatred, its language is a language of hatred, its doctrine is filled with hatred—and hatred, by its nature, always runs overboard, crossing geographical boundaries and ethnic affiliations. It is a contagious disease. He who hates one minority will hate all minorities—religious, political, ethnic, social and cultural—and is bound to wind up hating himself.

Of course, one often asks or is being asked: why anti-Semitism? Why such hatred? Is it because the hater's obsession is usually with power? His only way then to assert and confirm it is by using it so as to turn free persons into victims and victims into slaves and slaves into corpses. Never satisfied, never at peace with himself, suspicious of anyone unknown, the hater will forever be looking for

someone to shame and dominate and destroy. For the hater to feel alive, he needs to inflict suffering and death onto "the other". And the Jew was to him always "the other"—whose otherness he resented and feared.

Is antisemitism also due to the subconscious legacy of religious fanaticism alone? No, not alone. But for many centuries it was and still is. However, since Pope John the 23rd and thanks to Pope John-Paul the second, Jewish-Christian relations have improved. In fact, they have never been better. The oecumenical spirit has enabled both religions to conduct dialogues, encounters and initiate cooperation that bring honor to religion. (Incidentally, at that time, we should have invited Islam scholars and teachers to participate in these endeavors.)

Anti-Semitism had become, during the Hitler era, a pagan national religion whose god was Hitler and his hate-filled word considered to his worshipers as "sacred" dogma.

Why were so many Germans, of all ages and social spheres, attracted to him and to his ideas? Is it that hatred has seductive power? The hater lives in a world void of nuance and complexity. He entertains no doubts and admits to no hesitation. He knows what is good and what is evil, who is worthy of his sympathy and who of his anger, who must remain free and who must go to jail, who shall live and who shall die. To the antisemite, everything is reduced to primitive simplicity. He is unwilling and unable to see another point of view, another avenue of thought. He could never consider weighing both sides of a problem, or putting himself in another person's place, imagining himself as a Jew—his chosen victim..

Actually, the anti-Semite dwells in an unreal world of delusion and hallucination. He is persuaded that the Protocols of the Elders of Zion reflect a reality, that Jews do control or aim to dominate all other nations and their ways of life, that they treat all non-Jews as enemies. This belief is still being taught in certain Moslem countries where Jew-hatred is still part of official policy. In their schools, children are taught to go out and kill Jews—yes, not Israelis but Jews.

But here, in Berlin, I feel compelled to ask ourselves again the unavoidable question: if Auschwitz didn't cure the world of anti-Semitism, what can and what will?

What can be done to combat the reawakening of anti-Semitism? This question deserves to be given priority at this gathering. It is precisely that it takes place in Berlin, that a powerful message must be sent from here to governments and nations everywhere not to allow the anti-Semitic poison to spread for it brings dishonor to civilization wherever it exists.

Perhaps a manifesto is to be composed, distributed in all languages to all schools where, one day a year, one day every year, it be read and studied.

Is legislation the answer? It could be part of the answer.

Like racists, anti-Semites are to be shown not only as a source of peril but also as a vehicle of all that is irrational and threatening in the human condition. The racist is sometimes ugly and sometimes stupid; the anti-Semite, being the ultimate racist, is almost by definition both.

The history of Nazism teaches us that hatred is like cancer. It often grows underground, and when detected it is too late. If unchecked immediately, it will

invade its natural surroundings. What began in the mind will destroy the brain. Then the heart. And then? Remember: hatred destroys not only its target but also its carrier. Why not imagine proper punishment, be it as preventive social therapy?

In conclusion, I do not know the pertinent and total answer to human hatred. But I do know that anti-Semitism, in order to be defeated, needs to be first unmasked and then denounced, rejected and possibly outlawed.

For, contrary to most movements that have shaped history, it alone has no redeeming feature.

Like Nazism, it has nothing but a desire to destroy and remains a vision of implacable evil.

Let a warning go out from here to the world at large, and especially to places where anti-Semitism is still a threat: "Remember Berlin's past and learn from its dark memories. Whatever problems you may face, hatred must not be an answer. What anti-Semitism has done to Jews has left a burning scar on our grandchildren as well."

And to you, friends, who have come from near and far to oppose a common enemy, we say:

We shared with you our anguish; we offer you our thanks; and all we ask of you is that you share our hope.

Elie Wiesel



United States Mission to the OSCE

OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism Introductory Remarks For Session I

As prepared for delivery by Rep. Christopher Smith (R-NJ)
Chairman, U.S. Commission on Security and Cooperation in
Europe
Berlin, April 28, 2004

Thank you, Madame Moderator.

Excellencies, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, friends,

It is my great honor and privilege to address this distinguished body of individuals. Today, here in Berlin, once the epicenter of an obscene policy to eliminate European Jewry, we have gathered together to confront and, to the best of our abilities, vanquish a highly disturbing resurgence of anti-Semitism. I want to thank our German hosts for offering this historic opportunity.

We gather against the backdrop of a spike of anti-Semitic violence that has swept through much of the OSCE region, particularly in Western Europe. Unparalleled since the dark days of the Second World War, Jewish communities throughout Europe and North America again are facing violent attacks against synagogues, Jewish cultural sites, cemeteries and individuals. It is an ugly reality that won't go away by ignoring or by wishing it away. It must be defeated. Even in the eastern portions of the OSCE region, anti-Semitic acts occur in places long devoid of a Jewish presence.

This increase in violence is a chilling reminder that our societies still harbor a dangerous collection of bigots and racists who hate Jews.

Because of this grim reality, we gather to enlighten and motivate with particular emphasis on what practical steps we must take not just to mitigate this centuries-old obsession, but to crush this pernicious form of hate.

At the recent UN Human Rights Commission in Geneva, the representative of the Holy See said anti-Semitism is a "distinct form of intolerance with religious and racial characteristics" and is the "oldest and most continuous form of religious intolerance ever known."

George Washington's 1790 letter to Touro Synagogue stated clearly that America was to be a place of tolerance for all, and said America "gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance." One year later, France became the first European country to emancipate its Jewish population and offer equal citizenship.

More recently, during the horrors of World War II, Chairman-in-Office Passy's Bulgaria chose not to abandon its Jewish citizens. In the OSCE context, the 1990 Copenhagen Concluding document represented the first time an international body spoke specifically to the crime of anti-Semitism.

We hope the results of this Conference will serve as a blueprint for serious and hopefully bold action. Our words here in Berlin, however, must be repeated at home, with frequency, passion and tenacity and matched – and even exceeded – by deeds.

If our fight is to succeed, we need government officials at all levels to denounce, without hesitation or delay, anti-Semitic acts wherever and whenever they occur. No exceptions. The purveyors of hate never take a holiday or grow weary, nor should we. Holocaust remembrance and tolerance education must dramatically expand, and we need to ensure that our respective laws punish those who hate and incite violence against Jews.

The 18th century British Statesman and philosopher Edmund Burke prophetically said “the only thing necessary for evil to triumph is for good people to do nothing.”

When national leaders fail to denounce anti-Semitic violence and slurs, the void is not only demoralizing to the victims but silence actually enables the wrongdoing. Silence by elected officials in particular conveys approval – or at least acquiescence - and can contribute to a climate of fear and a sense of vulnerability.

For the last two years, President Bush and Members of Congress from both parties have spoken out repeatedly and forcefully. We have tried to do our “due diligence” to know the truth and to decipher trends. At one of our hearings in 2002, for example, the Simon Wiesenthal Center offered compelling evidence that showed that anti-Semitic incidents were increasing significantly in Western Europe, and the Anti-Defamation League reported that more than 1,500 anti-Semitic incidents occurred in the United States in both 2002 and 2003. We decided that more needed to be done. Last summer I, along with my friend and colleague Ben Cardin, sponsored a bipartisan congressional resolution denouncing anti-Semitism. The measure passed (412-0). When I return to Washington later this week, we will introduce another resolution to highlight what we are attempting to do here in Berlin. Furthermore, we partnered with Gert Weisskirchen and members of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly to address the unprecedented rise of anti-Semitic violence at our Annual Session in 2002. Together, our delegations have organized forums – in Berlin, Washington and Vienna – on anti-Semitism. In both 2002 and 2003, the OSCE PA unanimously approved resolutions condemning anti-Semitism.

So, clearly, our words this week are extremely important. I respectfully submit that they must be matched with deeds. Paper promises must be followed with concrete actions. To that end, there is no excuse for not putting in place an aggressive, sustainable monitoring program.

Last year's Maastricht Ministerial Council decision and last week's Permanent Council decision committed all participating States to collect and keep records on reliable information and statistics on hate crimes, including anti-Semitism. According to a report on “Official Indifference” written by Human Rights First, of fourteen OSCE countries reviewed, nine had no systematic monitoring. A surgeon can't remove a cancer or prescribe a course of

treatment, without documenting the nature, scope, and extent of the disease. We must find out what's going on!

For its part, the United States has been collecting hate crime information for almost 15 years. Many of the 50 States in the U.S. have enacted their own laws addressing hate crimes. Congress passed the federal Hate Crimes Statistics Act in 1990, which requires the Attorney General to collect data each year about crimes that "manifest evidence of prejudice." The most recent report available, the 2002 Hate Crimes Statistics Report, documented that religious bias motivated 19.1% of all hate crime incidents in the U.S. Of this total, a whopping 65.3% were anti-Semitic in nature.

One positive by-product of reporting is the impact it has on police. When solid reporting is coupled with police training fewer acts of anti-Semitic violence are likely to occur. The public sharing of this information at home and with the OSCE enhances accountability and allows interested communities and NGOs to craft and implement strategies. I therefore urge each of us to enhance our monitoring mechanisms and to promptly forward these findings to ODIHR.

A top to bottom review of laws, the enforcement of existing laws, and the enactment of new laws will help enormously. When France experienced a particularly high rate of anti-Semitic attacks in 2002, the French enacted a new statute. Mr. Pierre Lellouche, with us here today, was the champion behind these vital reforms. It is hoped that in each of our countries penalties that are commensurate with crimes motivated by anti-Semitic bias will have a chilling effect on those contemplating acts of hate, and surety of punishment for those who do.

Finally, if we are to protect our children from the dark evil of anti-Semitism, we must reeducate ourselves and systematically educate our children. While that starts in our homes, the classroom must be the incubator of tolerance. It seems to me that only the most hardened racist can remain unmoved by Holocaust education and remembrance. Only the most crass, evil, and prejudiced among us can study the horrors of the Holocaust and not cry out: Never again!

I urge you to consider making your nation a member of the Task Force for International Cooperation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance, and Research. Of the 16 current Task Force members, fourteen are OSCE participating States. Open to all countries willing to meet certain criteria, applicant countries must commit to open all public and private archives, establish some form of Holocaust remembrance, usually a national day of remembrance, and create or improve Holocaust education curricula.

In 1991, my home state of New Jersey established the Commission on Holocaust Education to promote Holocaust and genocide education standards throughout my state. The Commission is unique, and perhaps a model for others, as it regularly surveys the status of Holocaust education and the design of curricula to ensure that all schools are teaching about the Holocaust and genocide.

The Commission has developed more than 2,000 pages of material to aid New Jersey educators in teaching children about this painful, but important, topic. The New Jersey Commission is an innovative model for other OSCE participating States and local governments to emulate.

The Anti-Defamation League's "A World of Difference" Institute has delivered programs to more than 450,000 American teachers about the Holocaust and intolerance. The Federal Bureau of Investigation, the FBI, partners with the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum and the Anti-Defamation League teach new FBI trainees about law enforcement's role in the 1930s and 40s in abetting the Holocaust. Conducted at the Holocaust Museum, these sessions leave an indelible impression and lead to greater sensitivity and understanding. .

Abraham Lincoln once said concerning slavery: "To sin by silence when they should protest, makes cowards of men." Silence my friends is not an option. Nor is inaction.

Thank you.

Conférence de Berlin sur l'Antisémitisme

Discours de Pierre Lellouche, Membre du Parlement français

Merci Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Ministre.

C'est un grand honneur pour moi que d'avoir été invité à présenter devant vous, représentants des nations de l'OSCE, la loi du 3 février 2003, dont je suis l'auteur, visant à aggraver les peines en cas d'infraction racistes et antisémites. Dans la pratique constitutionnelle française, les textes d'origine parlementaire sont très rares : 3 ou 4% des textes viennent des députés, le reste vient du gouvernement. Et il est encore plus rare de voir une loi proposée par un député votée à l'unanimité de nos deux chambres.

Mais je dois à la vérité vous dire que je n'éprouve aucune fierté d'être ici aujourd'hui, et aucune fierté d'avoir dû prendre cette initiative législative. Si ce texte existe, c'est que la France a connu ces dernières années une véritable explosion de la haine et de la violence antisémite. Si nous sommes réunis ici -et je tiens à en remercier le gouvernement allemand- dans cet endroit tout à fait symbolique qu'est Berlin pour parler d'antisémitisme, c'est bien que, malheureusement, il y a un problème d'antisémitisme dans nos pays et que, 60 ans après la découverte des camps de concentration en Europe Centrale, on en est encore à redouter que le cancer de l'antisémitisme (comme le disaient Elie Wiesel et Simone Weil tout à l'heure) redevienne une réalité.

Ici je n'entends donner aucune leçon, ni même proposer ce texte comme un modèle, mais simplement faire un point très rapide du droit qui est présenté dans ce texte.

Le point de départ de mon initiative, c'est naturellement de constater l'augmentation très forte des violences et des menaces antisémites depuis l'année 2000, c'est à dire depuis le début de la deuxième Intifada. Depuis la deuxième Intifada le nombre de violences est passé brutalement à 119 en 2000, 195 en 2002, et il y en avait 125 encore en 2003, tandis que le nombre des intimidations et des menaces était de plus de 600 en 2000, plus de 700 en 2002, et encore presque de 500 en 2003.

Or dans la pratique j'ai constaté que ces faits n'étaient jamais poursuivis en tant que tels, parce que le droit ne le permettait pas, et que les auteurs de ces actes s'en tiraient le plus souvent sans grandes sanctions. Et en examinant l'état du droit français, je me suis aperçu qu'il était très riche en matière de sanctions dans deux domaines : les discriminations – et notamment en matière de droit du travail – et le droit de la presse – et la sanction de l'injure, de la négation, ou de l'appel à la haine raciale par voie de presse ou par voie d'écrit. Sans rentrer dans le détail, je dirais simplement que le droit français sanctionnait très efficacement, par exemple, le refus de fournir un bien ou service, la discrimination à l'embauche, la discrimination par des personnes dépositaires de l'autorité publique. De la même façon, notre droit était, depuis la loi de 1881, particulièrement efficace en matière de diffamation et

d'injures publiques, en matière de lutte contre l'apologie des crimes contre l'humanité. Depuis la loi Guessault du 13 juillet 1990 notre droit punissait également le négationnisme et la contestation des crimes contre l'Humanité tels que reconnus au tribunal de Nuremberg, et enfin d'autres mesures existaient comme par exemple la sanction de la profanation des cimetières, et notamment des cimetières juifs.

Mais, dans le cas des violences contre les biens et les personnes, il n'en coûtait pas plus cher de frapper quelqu'un pour lui voler son téléphone portable que de le frapper parce qu'il portait une kippa, une étoile juive ou un voile, ou parce que vous n'aimiez pas la couleur de sa peau, et de la même façon il n'en coûtait pas plus cher de brûler une automobile que de brûler une synagogue.

Et c'est contre cela que j'ai voulu réagir, par un dispositif très simple, et qui pourrait être repris dans le droit de nombreux pays, encore que cette idée d'intention raciste existait dans de nombreuses législations : dans la jurisprudence britannique, en Italie, au Portugal, en Suisse, en Norvège, en Autriche, en Suède, au Canada, au Danemark, en République Tchèque, il y a des morceaux qui touchent à l'intention raciste. J'ai voulu essayer de systématiser cette intention par un texte très simple, qui dit ceci : «Les peines encourues pour un crime ou un délit sont aggravées lorsque l'infraction est commise à raison de l'appartenance ou de la non-appartenance, vraie ou supposée, de la victime à une ethnie, une nation, une race ou une religion déterminée ». Pour que la circonstance aggravante s'applique, il faut la prouver objectivement par un certain nombre d'éléments de preuve, par exemple des déclarations, des écrits, des insultes, des ouvrages, et le juge ensuite apprécie. L'effet de cette circonstance aggravante est lourd, puisqu'on assiste à une aggravation considérable des peines, ainsi par exemple en matière d'homicide volontaire nous passons grâce à ce texte de 30 ans de réclusion à la réclusion perpétuelle, en matière de violences ayant entraîné la mort sans intention de la donner on passe à 20 ans de réclusion criminelle au lieu de 15, etc. Et en matière de dégradation de biens privés par moyens dangereux, la réclusion est de 20 ans au lieu de 10 ans d'emprisonnement.

Donc dans toute l'échelle des peines, la circonstance aggravante permet de faire une très forte exemplarité pour celui qui commet ce type d'acte.

Pour conclure, je le dis aux ministres qui sont ici, nous n'avons pas d'instruments statistiques précis en matière de chiffrage de ces délits et des condamnations. Il manque aussi en Europe un système d'harmonisation de ces statistiques (ainsi les chiffres que je vais vous donner sont insuffisants), et je crois que cela devrait être l'objet de cette conférence que d'essayer de le déterminer.

Malgré l'entrée en vigueur de cette loi et les efforts absolument déterminés du gouvernement français, le nombre de violence reste élevé en France (165 actes de violence en 2003, plus de 450 actes d'intimidation et de menace). La loi elle-même a été utilisée dans une vingtaine de cas en 2003 et elle a été retenue sept fois, ce qui est peu. Ceci souligne d'une part la difficulté d'apporter des preuves dans certains cas, et d'autre part (pardonnez moi d'être aussi franc) la nécessité de faire évoluer les mentalités parmi la magistrature. Ce bilan

confirme ce que nous savions tous : la sanction ne règle pas le problème. Ce qui le règle, c'est d'identifier les causes, et ensuite de travailler dès l'école.

Pour dire les choses simplement. Comme l'a dit Madame Weil ce matin, la France n'est pas antisémite. L'antisémitisme et les violences antisémites dont nous héritons aujourd'hui sont importés malheureusement de la violence du Proche-Orient. Il n'y a rigoureusement rien à voir entre les violences antisémites d'aujourd'hui et celles des années 1930. Je constate qu'au nom de l'anti-sionisme et au nom des conflits du Proche-Orient, une partie de la jeunesse issue de l'immigration en France se livre malheureusement à ce type de violences, et c'est contre cela qu'il faut réagir. Et je dirais à Joschka Fischer, pour lequel j'ai beaucoup de respect, que mon rêve n'est pas seulement d'organiser une conférence en Europe sur l'antisémitisme européen, ce serait de voir demain une OSCE du Proche-Orient se pencher sur les causes de la haine anti-juive, j'aimerais qu'un jour se tienne à Ryad, au Caire, à Amman, une réunion sur la haine anti-juive. C'est malheureusement par la télévision, par le net que la haine anti-juive, qui était européenne dans les années 1930, est aujourd'hui recyclée et forme des générations entières contre les Juifs, et cela concerne aussi malheureusement les minorités musulmanes chez nous. Voilà les causes de la violence, il faut être lucide sur ce phénomène.

J'ai fait cette loi et je suis content qu'elle ait été votée par mon pays. Elle est mise en œuvre. Mais je crois qu'il faut appeler un chat un chat et être lucide sur les vraies causes du phénomène. Merci de votre attention./.

PC.DEL/356/04
29 April 2004

ENGLISH
Original: RUSSIAN

Russian Federation

**STATEMENT BY MRS. ELLA PAMFILOVA,
CHAIRPERSON OF THE COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS
UNDER THE PRESIDENT OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION, AT THE
OSCE CONFERENCE ON ANTI-SEMITISM**

Berlin, 28–29 April 2004

Mr. Chairman,
Distinguished Conference Participants,

In our attitude to anti-Semitism, we take the position that the countering of this evil — just like the countering of racism, xenophobia and neo-Nazism — is an organic part of the struggle for human rights in general.

Why is anti-Semitism so enduring? How is the anti-Semitic virus mutating today, and what does one need to do in order that the vaccine against ethnic and religious intolerance provides lasting immunity and that this disease, which manifests itself in hatred towards persons of a different ethnic origin, does not become a chronic one? It seems to us that this is not merely a matter of historic roots and centuries-old conflicts. We also need to take into account the fact that at the dawn of the twenty-first century ugly anti-Semitic tendencies have begun to gain fresh momentum.

Frequently, manifestations of anti-Semitism reveal that this phenomenon is exacerbated during critical periods of societal change, when anti-Semitism — as a specific form of xenophobia — takes on the role of a kind of “lightning conductor” for social tension. It is important when assessing the situation with regard to anti-Semitism to take into account all the factors, including political, social, economic, demographic, religious and cultural ones. The level of anti-Semitism is largely determined by the degree of general ethnic intolerance within a society, the overall prevalence of ethnic extremism and the situation regarding crimes inspired by ethnic, racial and religious hatred in general.

I should like to emphasize that, in the very difficult circumstances arising out of the collapse of the Soviet Union and the emergence of a number of acute inter-ethnic conflicts, our country and society **has, on the whole, been able to preserve the foundations of peace** and mutual respect and tolerance in ethnic relations. Russia is the largest multi-ethnic and multi-faith country in the world, a country where throughout history different cultures and

national traditions have coexisted. Our country is unique because of the way in which different value systems are combined.

What does modern Russian anti-Semitism look like? How does it differ from the anti-Semitism of the past or from its analogue, for example, in western Europe?

The most important thing is that **State-sponsored anti-Semitism is absent** from modern, democratic Russia. Our country has developed a complete legal framework for responding to manifestations of anti-Semitism. The highest officials constantly take a stand against xenophobia and anti-Semitism. This is something positive, and it is recognized as such by both the Russian and the international public. However, everyday anti-Semitism is very much alive, and although its level is falling this fact should not reassure us, because manifestations of anti-Semitism, racism and xenophobia are still extremely dangerous and are a breeding ground for extremism.

Russian anti-Semitism is different in that it does not have the anti-Israeli character anti-Semitism has in some other European countries.

The activities of skinhead groups are current ugly manifestations of ethnic extremism, racism, xenophobia and anti-Semitism.

However, these groups are characterized not so much by anti-Semitism as by aggressive xenophobia, primarily towards migrants from the Caucasus, the Central Asian Republics of the former Soviet Union and African countries. Although the surge in anti-Semitism that has troubled the entire western world in recent years has passed Russia by, we cannot accept such ugly phenomena as attacks on synagogues, the vandalizing of Jewish cultural buildings and memorials, the dissemination of aggressive anti-Semitic literature, “electronic” anti-Semitism on the Internet, where a number of sites play an inflammatory role, the use of anti-Semitic rhetoric in election and political campaigns, and also the manufacturing of anti-Semitic symbols, which are circulated among young people in the form of badges, patches, and so on. This marginal market of anti-Semitic products has found a small but stable source of customers.

The existence of everyday anti-Semitism has been exploited by some extreme nationalistic parties in their election campaigns.

Thanks to the efforts of voluntary organizations, including Jewish ones, such as the Federation of Jewish Communities of Russia and the Moscow Bureau for Human Rights, it has been possible to bring these extremist candidates to the attention of the federal authorities and to prevent them from participating in the elections.

In a great majority of cases, anti-Semitic rhetoric did not help the candidates to obtain additional points during elections — virtually all of them remained outside the newly elected Russian Parliament.

This shows that **the Russian public is becoming more aware of and less susceptible to anti-Semitism.**

As a result of a great deal of pressure from the public and decisive actions on the part of the authorities, it has been possible to nip in the bud the most dangerous manifestation of

anti-Semitism — the appearance of anti-Semitic slogans on booby-trapped billboards — a monstrous symbiosis of anti-Semitism, xenophobia and terrorism.

Russian non-governmental organizations are focusing particular attention on monitoring how the authorities respond to anti-Semitism. There are some problems here. The increased efforts observed on the part of the law enforcement system with regard to acts of vandalism against Jewish cultural buildings rarely lead to actual criminal sentencing. We are extremely concerned at the overall low level of preventive work, particularly with disadvantaged young people. In the majority of cases, the authorities only respond when an offence has been committed.

Something positive that ought to be mentioned is the fact that the authorities have begun to pay more attention to anti-Semitic and xenophobic comments in the media.

For example, following two warnings, the editor-in-chief of the Volgograd newspaper “*Kazachii Krug*” was removed from his post. In Novosibirsk, criminal proceedings were brought against the newspaper “*Russkaya Sibir*” for the publication of anti-Semitic articles. The office of the public prosecutor for the Novosibirsk region filed a lawsuit to close down this newspaper for fomenting ethnic discord. I could go on citing such examples. What is most important, and Mr. Alexander Akselrod, Director of the Tolerance Foundation, agrees with me, is that “the Combating of Extremist Activities Act is beginning to be applied to publications that commit such violations”. Only tolerance — as an active position in life, a moral duty and a political and judicial requirement — can counter the turbid wave of inter-ethnic enmity and prejudice.

A federal programme has been adopted in Russia to promote tolerant attitudes and prevent extremism in Russian society. It is designed to provide State support for the process of building a civil society and includes the creation of socio-psychological services at various levels — federal, regional and municipal — and the introduction of a humanitarian and psychological evaluation of textbooks, educational programmes and criteria for the professional training of civil servants and persons employed by law enforcement agencies, the authorities and the media. It is now very important that this programme should be fully implemented.

The fight against anti-Semitism — and against racial discrimination in general — cannot be reduced to merely responding to anti-Jewish comments in the media or acts of vandalism. These efforts must be **systematic**. Any manifestation of racial **intolerance** or racial **exclusiveness** must undergo a fundamental evaluation. Europe has already paid too high a price to allow these theories to become a tragic practice. The fact that the OSCE is taking up the issue of anti-Semitism today — 60 years after the victory over fascism and the farewell to the victims of the Holocaust — is evidence that all is not well in this area. It is unfortunate that European Union countries and the United States of America did not support the resolution condemning all manifestations of xenophobia, racism and racial discrimination that was proposed by Russia and adopted by the United Nations Commission on Human Rights. Only through our joint efforts, in co-operation with the OSCE, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the Council of Europe, can we save the civilized world from this threat of neo-Nazism.

The specific characteristics of Russia as a vast country require attention to be given to the manifestations of anti-Semitism in areas where the authorities used frequently to tolerate

manifestations of anti-Semitism on the pretext of interpreting federal laws differently. Through the system of representatives of the President of Russia in the federal districts, regional laws have been brought into line with federal ones.

The attendance of senior Russian officials at major Jewish events and the high regard for the role and place of Jews in Russian history, science and culture help to create a favourable environment for Jews in Russian society and strengthen their confidence in the positive actions of the authorities. Proof of this can be seen, in particular, in the considerable increase in the number of synagogues, the broad coverage in the media of Jewish communities and their problems, and a growing readiness on the part of Jewish organizations to assert their rights.

The monitoring carried out by Jewish voluntary organizations of manifestations of anti-Semitism offers vital support to the Russian authorities in their efforts to combat this evil, and these activities deserve the highest praise.

In recent years, Russian organizations have held more than 100 major events and campaigns of nationwide importance. Over the last 10 years, the number of Jewish autonomous regional and local cultural bodies, community centres, religious organizations and associations for children and young people has quadrupled and there are currently more than 130 of them.

Jewish radio stations, newspapers, magazines and Internet clubs are in operation. All this has made it possible for Mr. Mark Grubarg, President of the Federation of Jewish Communities of Russia, to say: "Today, the authorities are one step ahead of the general public in their understanding of the importance of harmonious and tolerant relations with the Jewish community".

A symbolic event in the life of Russia's Jewish communities was the opening of a unique building, Europe's largest synagogue in Moscow, which also includes a Jewish cultural centre. President Vladimir Putin was present for its inauguration and referred to this unique building as "our common pride".

As examples of the activities of the civil society institutions developing in Russia, one might mention the Moscow Bureau for Human Rights, which was established in 2002 with the help of the Moscow Helsinki Group. The Bureau co-ordinates its work in co-operation with our Commission, the Russian Ombudsman, the State Duma, the Human Rights Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences and the Centre for Journalism in Extreme Situations.

Joint projects include the establishment of the website "sem40", which provides legal advice to victims and also daily monitoring of "anti-Semitism, xenophobia and religious persecution in Russian regions". This is a large-scale project that is being carried out in co-operation with 50 regional organizations, 30 editorial offices and 50 ethnic and religious associations. The material prepared is sent to the Presidential Administration, the heads of the constituent entities of the Federation, the office of the public prosecutor and the Ministry of Justice.

Thanks largely to human rights organizations, including Jewish ones, a Holocaust museum and information centre has been opened in Moscow. Educational programmes and

numerous round tables and seminars are organized at the museum. The subject of the Holocaust and its victims is constantly at the centre of the attention of human rights activists.

One need only recall that the first symposium on the problems of the Holocaust and tolerance was held 10 years ago in Moscow on the initiative of the eminent historian Mr. Mikhail Gefter. To date, a considerable number of events devoted to the memory of the victims of Nazism have been organized. Quite recently, a large-scale conference entitled “Living History — Lessons of the Holocaust” took place in Nizhni Novgorod.

Specific activities to counter all forms of extremism should not merely result in discussions and round tables involving intellectuals. We need to actively develop networks throughout the entire country. Will the authorities’ efforts to solve all these difficult problems be enough? Of course, the answer is no. The effectiveness of these activities can be judged only on the basis of their results, and results are only possible through joint efforts on the part of society and the authorities. We need to improve the awareness of citizens, we need institutions of expertise to deal with the problems of xenophobia and anti-Semitism, we need better qualifications for those employed by the office of the public prosecutor, the courts and the police and we need better law enforcement practices in this field. Without encroaching on freedom of the media, we also need to consider a judicial mechanism for countering the circulation of anti-Semitic newspapers and other literature in Russia.

In view of all these difficulties and shortcomings, the most important thing is that there is a political will on the part of the authorities and society to co-operate and interact in this narrow field. In closing, I should like to cite some conclusions drawn by the Moscow Bureau for Human Rights: “...anti-Semitism is not the most pressing phobia in Russia... For their part, the authorities began last year to make systematic efforts to counter extremism in general and anti-Semitism in particular. Even if the anti-extremism law is eliciting a great many critical comments, the authorities’ efforts to stamp out anti-Semitic propaganda deserve great praise”.

Thank you for your attention.

**Speech by
Edgar M. Bronfman,
President of the World Jewish Congress.
at the OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism**

Berlin, 28 April 2004

This afternoon, we are talking about anti-Semitism. I remember not very long ago a meeting in Stockholm of all the countries that had been involved in the Holocaust. Country after country's president or prime minister stood up, decried what the Nazis had done and described efforts of atonement in his own bailiwick. That was less than ten years ago, and here we are of necessity, speaking again about this oldest of hatreds. Right now, we are not speaking of something that happened yesterday, but of something that is staining our mutual history all over again.

The history of anti-Semitism is long and ugly. Jews who once had their own country, and thank the Lord do again, were scattered throughout the face of the earth, persecuted by the Catholic Church, scratching out a living as best they could, with countless trades and professions denied them. Still, they clung tenaciously to their beliefs, despite unthinkable cruelty on the part of their neighbours, led, let's face it squarely, by the Church of Rome.

Our Torah commands us to love the stranger as ourselves, and Jesus, a good Jew amongst his other attributes, preached loving kindness. Yet crusaders practised their swordsmanship on Jewish men, women and children, going to and from their destination, and anti-Semitic fervour again reached a new peak in the days of the Inquisition. Wearing a yellow star on their outer garments was not a new thing done to the Jews by Adolf Hitler. It had previously been done by the successor of St. Peter, the Pope in Rome.

Europeans have been taught to hate Jews for centuries, and now, something new has been added to the mix, a large influx of Moslems from North Africa and Turkey to do the work most Europeans shun. They brought with them the anti-Semitism of their own societies, coupled with a new excuse: Israel and the conflict between the Jews and the Palestinians.

Anti-Semitism is quite extreme in the countries of Europe, partially out of an old habit, and partially out of a lack of understanding. Europe, for the most part, has sided with the Palestinians. Let me remind this audience that Israel, under the leadership of Prime Minister Ehud Barak, tried to give almost everything back to Yasser Arafat at Camp David in 1999, and was answered with the second *intifada*.

Suicide bombings have terrorized Israeli citizens, and it is difficult to comprehend living one's life under such gruesome conditions. But Israel is strong, and only seeks a partner to achieve a peaceful settlement, as it did with President Anwar Sadat of Egypt and King Hussein of Jordan.

I could talk about the corruption of the Arafat regime, and the living expenses of his wife and child in Paris, but I won't. The purpose of this conference and of my remarks is to find a solution to the renewed sickness of European anti-Semitism. One might have thought that the Holocaust was a lesson no-one would ever forget, teaching mankind the inevitable result of bias and hatred. But hundreds of thousands were slaughtered in Cambodia, in Rwanda and in the Balkans, and ethnic cleansing is happening in Sudan despite the fact that ethnic cleansing reminds us so starkly of Hitlerism.

Need I remind you that it was the United States of America which had to lead its European allies to crush a regime which threatened to murder thousands of Europeans? My country isn't perfect, but the Democratic Party nominated a Jew as its vice-presidential candidate. Jews are not isolated in my country, nor does anyone do violence to them, or their property. It is safe to wear yarmulkes, it is safe to go to synagogue and pray, and it is safe to gather anywhere at anytime, just as it should be. I wish the same held true for Europe.

Perhaps it is well that this meeting is taking place in Berlin. Following the unspeakable era of the Holocaust, West Germany made strong laws against anti-Semitism, and taught the Holocaust - today, the German Federal Republic still teaches the lessons of the Holocaust to its youth. No government should tolerate any violent attacks by haters on any persons whatever. If laws are not strict enough, tougher laws must be enacted, or the spiral of hatred will continue.

But more than react, I must insist that European nations, together with the Roman Catholic, the Orthodox and all the Protestant Churches, initiate teaching mutual respect. That's the goal of all civilizations, and it must be done with immediacy. Nationalism was the disease of the 20th century, bringing with it hatred, xenophobia and anti-Semitism of Holocaust proportions, and then Europe and America were faced with the Cold War.

Now our emphasis must focus on mutual respect, learning to live positively with diversity. Just as Europe has embraced unity and mutuality, so must it now embrace mutual respect of all nationalities, all religions, and indeed, all peoples.

It has been said that democracy is the rule of the majority. But the essence of democracy is more properly the protection of minority rights. And it is against this standard that all nations shall be judged in the United Nations General Assembly. At the last session of the UN General Assembly, Ireland introduced just such a resolution and the world will be watching to see if it can be adopted later this year. The campaign to secure its adoption is already underway, and we view this conference of the OSCE as one important step in that effort.

In *Nostra Aetate*, Pope John XXIII proclaimed an end to Roman Catholic anti-Semitism, and Pope John Paul II has ushered in a new respect for Judaism, and has shown us graciousness. His trip to Israel was historic as he acknowledged the Jewish state and its symbolism at Yad Vashem.

Pope John Paul II has also stated on many occasions that anti-Semitism is a sin before God. The Orthodox Church has stated without equivocation that mutual respect is part of its doctrine, and that anti-Semitism is a sin. So must all churches, and all religions. I have met with both the Pope and the Patriarch, who have iterated their strong stands on anti-Semitism.

Now is the time - it has to be the time - for every school system in Europe to teach the basic ethics of mutual respect. Now is the time, and has to be the time, for every priest and clergyman on the continent, to constantly preach against the sin of xenophobia, against the sin of anti-Semitism, and must follow the dictates of his or her religion, be it Islam, Judaism or Christianity, and must insist on the Godliness of mutual respect and love of one's fellow man.

Let me suggest that France, which has set aside funds as a result of the pilfering of art owned by Jews and stolen during the Holocaust period, use some of those funds to develop the curricula necessary to teach this doctrine of mutual respect. I am sure that the chair of the commission, Mme. Simone Weil, would be the perfect person to start this initiative. I am sure that the superb educator and Holocaust survivor, Elie Wiesel, would add his wisdom and experience to the exercise. Every country in Europe must follow suit. The stakes are too high to do otherwise.

Thank you.

OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism
Berlin, 28 – 29 April 2004

PC.NGO/3/04
28 April 2004

Introducer, Working Session 3: The Role of Education

Jerzy Jedlicki

ENGLISH on

"Otwarta Rzeczpospolita" [The Open Republic]:
Association against Anti-Semitism and Xenophobia
Warsaw, Poland

Whoever is preparing to combat anti-Semitism by means of education, is faced with two apparently contradictory currents. I will present them using Poland as an example.

On one hand there is a remarkable increase of interest in Jewish history, religion, ethnography, literature, music etc. among the young Polish generation. Never before had there been such a rich presence of Jewish subjects on the book market, or on the lists of masters' and doctoral dissertations. Many school teachers took courses offered by the Jewish Historical Institute in Warsaw and hundreds of their pupils wrote essays about the Jewish communities that had once flourished in their towns. There are numerous local initiatives aimed at unearthing of scarce traces of vibrant Jewish presence before the *Endlösung*. The Cracow festival of Jewish culture attracts every year thousands of young people from all over the country and abroad who take part in various workshops and lectures, sing and dance in the streets. Warsaw film festival "Jewish motives" was also a success. Many volunteers participate in actions against prejudice and hate, for example erasing anti-Semitic graffiti.

On the other hand, graffiti would soon reappear after each cleaning. The name "Jews" still serves as an insult against a competing football team, or just against anybody in any game. This is a kind of anti-Semitism without a real target, because anybody, politicians in the first place, can be nominated a Jew. However, some nationalist journalists, priests, or party leaders will eagerly tell those poor and ignorant hooligans where they should look for an eternal enemy conspiring always to

the detriment of their country. Violent incidents motivated by anti-Semite prejudice are still rare in that part of Europe, but hate speech is abundant and the laws forbidding it are seldom if ever applied. Conscious anti-Semitism is now usually linked with resistance to the European integration, and this anti-liberal mixture seems attractive to some segments of the society. Since, however, the Jewish communities in today Poland are hardly visible, many young people who have learned the vocabulary of prejudice have never had any touch with things Jewish. Besides, the authors of books or editors of journals that are full of slander and defamation would use a cryptic language of the type "I am not an anti-Semite, but..." Thus, the analysts who wrote a report for the Council of Europe, gave it an ironic title "Anti-Semitism without Jews and without anti-Semites". Whatever its disguise, this populist variety may become dangerous, as it encourages juvenile squads with Nazi emblems to dare to emerge from the underground.

There is a huge gap between these two opposite currents and one may reasonably ask whom the education programmes should be addressed to? The convinced anti-Semites are rather impervious to rational arguments and knowledge. So the main target of education should be the large majority of young people who have no definite views in this respect, yet are not always immune to prejudice that is deeply rooted in traditional European cultures. This majority in Poland knows very little about the history and destinies of the once largest Jewish community in the world. History textbooks usually devoted page or two to its annihilation by the Nazis and the heroic Warsaw Ghetto uprising, weaved into a broader narrative of the cruel German occupation and the valiant resistance offered by the Polish underground. A couple of short stories about the fate of Jews were on the reading list for secondary

school students, but all this was clearly not enough to arouse sympathy for and solidarity with the murdered nation that seemed exotic and alien.

The teachers and authors of school curricula had to answer to themselves the question how to teach history of Jews so as to bring home its importance to students. The debates led to the conclusion that teaching about the Shoah alone, as if it were an isolated historical event, is not productive. The Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth before its partitions in the eighteenth century, and then Polish, Lithuanian, Belorussian and Ukrainian lands were a home for a particular culture of Ashkenazi Jews, with their beliefs, sacred rituals, a specific style of life, distinct everyday language, and in the twentieth century, with rich literature, theatre, press and a variety of political movements. Yet until recently even university courses in history, literature or arts hardly gave any substantial information about that lost and largely forgotten world. This has started to change in the last decade. Many efforts were made to teach the teachers, to provide historical data and to overcome traditional, narrowly national approach to cultural history. In the best new school textbooks one can find presentation of Poland-Lithuania as a huge multicultural state in which Polish, German, Ukrainian and Jewish idioms coexisted side by side.

At that point, however, another strategic problem appears: whether to stress affinity of sentiments and mutual cultural influences, or rather to regard minority cultures as separate and independent entities. This is by no means a trivial question, since for the whole twentieth century the writers and historians who wanted to oppose anti-Semite arguments by arousing feelings of empathy were eager to show that Jews were good patriots and loyal citizens of the country they loved, and gave Poland so many creative minds and talents. Hardly anybody realized at that time that there was a shade of a patronizing attitude in such approach. However, the opposite

habit of teaching history of the Diaspora with no regard to the societies in the midst of which the Jews settled and prospered for a long time seems by no means a better solution. We believe that the two approaches should be balanced.

They are indeed combined in a recently published book by Robert Szuchta and Piotr Trojanski, under the title *The Holocaust: Understand Why* – destined to serve as an auxiliary handbook for Polish secondary schools. In spite of what the title may suggest the narrative starts with the complex dilemma of Jewish identity, then gives a brief outline of history of European Jews and their heritage, and of the parallel history of anti-Judaism and anti-Semitism, with special regard to Germany. Consequently, the Holocaust appears as a final stage of the perennial politics of hatred and humiliation, and the authors do not leave out the shameful pages of the history of their own nation in this respect. A student who will go through this clear and sincere narrative, based upon a wealth of Polish and foreign research, should understand that Shoah was a terrible crime against humanity, but also that it was an annihilation of a grand tradition and vivid culture, distinct and close to ours at the same time. In this way the student should learn to transcend the wall of indifference that may still be in his or her mind, but not to efface real cultural differences that once made the country so diverse.

An international exchange of educational experience, a forum for comparison of curricula and textbooks would be very useful. Voluntary associations have a role to play in such an exchange. Central European ministries of education are not lacking in good will and expertise, yet bureaucratic routine slows down the implementation of new ideas. NGOs, having very modest means at their disposal, cannot of course replace public institutions, but should inspire and stimulate them, and evaluate the results of governmental education policies.

Distributed at the request of ITALY

PC.DEL/321/04 /Corr.1
28 April 2004

OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism
Berlin, 28 – 29 April 2004

THE ROLE OF EDUCATION

ENGLISH only

Before embarking in the discussion of the very item of the role of education within the activities of the ITF that I have been asked to introduce as acting chair of the ITF, it might be appropriate to say in a few words what the ITF in fact is, should some of you not have a clear knowledge of what it is and how it was created.

The Task Force for International Cooperation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance and Research, to which are now part 16 States, was created in 1998 as a reaction to resurgent nasty episodes of anti-Semitism in various parts of Europe, some of them being particularly worrisome for their symbolic value. The corner-stone document is the so-called Declaration of Stockholm, a paper issued at the Stockholm Conference of the year 2000, that clearly defines the commitments of the members of the ITF. Among these stands prominently the role of education which is specified, not by chance, in the very title of the Task Force as the first scope of activity to be pursued. Why is it so that this element is so outstandingly singled out?

The reason for underlying this element is to be found in our strong belief that only a very good knowledge and deep-seeded conscience of the roots on which anti-Semitism is thriving can be the real bulwark and the jumping-pad against the repetition of the horrible sequel of events that brought about what we now call the Shoah - an event so tragic and unbelievable in our times. It became widely known only at the end of world war 2 and it was such an upsetting discovery that some people could not believe to have taken place while others refuse to admit the reality of that tragedy. It is an event that has blotched our continent and stands as a permanent black mark for the entire mankind. It is true, other massacres have existed in the past and, I hate to say it, still exist to-day in our planet but the Shoah - unlike any other - stands out in its uniqueness because it was a deliberate and scientifically planned and coldly carried-out project of mass destruction of an entire single group of people that can be identified only by religion, not by other elements such as nationality or similar other distinctions, big being the differences of the various groups of Jews even in Europe. The roots of that monstrous project of the nazis is to be found in the ideology of an alleged superiority of one people over any others - the arian race they called it using a scientifically wrong and unfounded concept. A supposed superiority, which in fact was only intolerance towards anyone different, stemming from ignorance and stupid prejudice. And this is what we are all called to fight now before it is too late, and here comes the role allotted to our generation - to eradicate all these false and perverse ideologies. How can it be done? The answer is: through education and with special attention devoted to the younger generation. Even these few hints may provide you with a clue for better understanding along which lines moves the activity of the members of ITF, who have already finalised two main documents on the various facets of the issue of education, the so-called "What" and "Why" documents - two titles that clearly indicate the scope and aim of them. A third document is now under study and we hope to finalise it on the occasion of the first Plenary Assembly under the Italian chairmanship, hopefully already this June: this document is called "How". Admittedly, this is by far the most delicate document of the lot because it touches upon the selection of common and basic parameters for the best suited methodology for spreading out to the students of the various countries the knowledge of the historic facts and sites of the Shoah while also taking into account the specificity of each country both for the characteristics of their students as recipients of the knowledge or for some of them being close or far relatives or

descendants of those of their countrymen who lived-through or were victims of the Shoah . The on-going semantic disputes of this document reflect in fact different approaches as far as the schools' or academic curricula are concerned not forgetting that the possibility of influence or impose them is a touchy issue impinging either on the autonomy of the cultural academic or on that of the governmental authorities, while other differences concern also other pragmatic or practical aspects like availability of texts and suitable translations . Yet these differences instead of standing as obstacles do in fact pave the way to better grasping the implications involved, while at the same time they foster and deepen the research for a wider and better methodology to be applied in the teaching of Holocaust.

Another way by which the ITF works in the field of education is to encourage the spreading out ,within the schooling and academic network of each of the member-countries , the conscience of the necessity of teaching the Holocaust as a tragic –but in a sense an eloquent and therefore useful one - example of the consequences of wrong ideologies , the ideologies and prejudices on which thrive even to-day anti-Semitism, intolerance, and fanaticisms. Such an activity is pursued also in non- member countries by means of so-called "liaison projects" , which are partly financed by the special Fund of the ITF. From January last year 26 projects have been approved for a total amount of some 400.000 dollars. Among them special attention was devoted to training the educators so as to give them the proper tools to , on their turn ,educate their pupils . A meritorious work on this field is done by several institutions in various countries – of course in Italy too – and among them a special role is played by Yad Vashem .

However, teaching is not the only way to educate – educate encompasses in fact a wider concept than the only though very important task of spreading out the knowledge of the facts of the past . I would say that teaching implies also something more and higher than that . It means to form and model the minds of our children . The Romans said : " Historia magistra vitae " . Yet history is not only what we learn through the books ,history is also what we learn through even more direct contacts with the reality of the past : history are also the monuments that we can visit or see with our own eyes . This is why – and forgive me if I quote an Italian experience but I believe that this example could be followed by other countries – many Italian schools do not limit their teaching to inserting in their curricula books or lectures on Holocaust –they also organise travels and visits to Auschwitz and other memorial sites . They show videos and some of them even create their own films and CD Roms on the tragedy of Holocaust, while others participate as actors in plays related to the issue. And not only that : for the past two years – and so will be done again - the Italian Ministry of Education,University and Research has organised – together with the Union of the Italian Jewish Communities – a contest among the pupils of the elementary up to the second grades schools on subjects related to the Shoah and the prize-giving ceremony (to which even the President of the Republic took part) is geared towards the Day of the Memory (the 27 of January) . To give you an idea of the dimension of this event I am proud to tell you that this year more the 13000 students presented their works, the quality of which was so high and impressive to make it difficult for the jury to single out the winners. Another path that can be followed is the organisation of seminars open to academicians and students : such an event is now being organized by the University of Roma Three on the figure of Primo Levi as a survivor of the Shoah and as a world-known writer . It will take place in Rome on June the 10th. I think it is an event of very relevant interest that deserves special attention by all of you . Another seminar is to be organised in autumn, probably on teaching the Shoah in multicultural societies .

A third way to spreading out the knowledge of the Shoah both as a historic fact and as a reality to be analysed in its different facets – and I mean facts, sites, ideological roots and so on – is to contribute to the dissemination both of books and testimonial documents and of the direct experiences of the still living survivors. Again I quote here an Italian experience: the wonderful cooperation between the Italian State Archives and the Shoah Foundation, that has already brought about the recording of the testimony of some 400 survivors to be elaborated in a long footage of films and videos. Spielberg - in Rome these very days – praised such a governmental Italian activity as possibly a unique one.

These are some of the practical solutions that can be adopted along the general path towards the main goal to reach – to prepare the younger generations to match the new challenges that already now are confronting us but that will confront them even more in the future as a result of the ongoing process of mondialisation of the contacts and of easier travels and migrating possibilities open to an ever bigger mass of men and women for moving from one part of the world to the others. The main challenge to be confronted with is to convince our children of the importance of being open and ready to accept the existence of a pluralistic culture, a culture free of unfounded and sometimes stupid prejudices, where racism, sexism and intolerance towards anything or anyone different will no longer exist, where different religious credos can freely co-exist one along the other in mutual respect. Awareness of what happened in the past, a critical knowledge of stereotypes, the capacity of monitoring behaviours jeopardising or challenging different cultures are the corner-stones for the education of the future citizens and at the same time are the fundamental elements, better said, the rampart towards the repetition of tragic mistakes committed in the past both at the individual and social levels.

I mentioned previously the role of the Italian Universities in education, and I am proud to say that a network of some 70 academicians has been created in Italy with the aim of exchanging experiences and ideas as well as discussing the problems of interest. At the student level monothematic courses are organized and degree topics on Holocaust and anti-Semitism are a common practice in various universities. The most valuable essays are thereafter publicized thus favouring interdisciplinary research. This happens because we in Italy have concluded that a historic, juridical, literary, anthropological and psychosocial research has resulted in a deeper knowledge of the issue of anti-Semitism and we have seen that the conclusions of a serious commitment in research has been reflected in up-dated pedagogic and didactical practices.

Should we use a compact lemma for the role of education I would say – and with this I conclude my intervention – that education is “remembering the past while shaping the future”. Admittedly, it is not an easy task, it is a serious challenge. Yet – and forgive me if I use once more an old latin expression – we must also be convinced that “Nihil difficile volenti”. In other words, we must all – and I am here somewhat quoting what the Italian writer Vittorio Alfieri said of his way of learning: we must all of us “will, will, strongly will” work and join forces aiming at the same goal – the eradication of anti-Semitism, intolerance, false prejudices and stupid stereotypes and don’t forget that will-power is also imbued with and a result of heart and brain. So, let us, by means of a well-planned education, instil into the minds of our children the important truth of the necessity of being tolerant and devoid of false prejudices. If we succeed in this difficult endeavour the future of mankind will no longer be bleak!

Giorgio Franchetti Pardo

Berlin, April 28, 2004

**“The Role of Education”
Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe
Conference on Antisemitism
Berlin, April 28, 2004**

by

David A. Harris

Executive Director, American Jewish Committee

Mr. Chairman, distinguished delegates,

Permit me to commend the 55 OSCE member nations for holding this timely conference on antisemitism. Your concern sends a powerful message about the importance you attach to the current struggle against what has been accurately described as the world’s most enduring hatred.

How appropriate that Bulgaria now occupies the chair of the OSCE Permanent Council, given its laudable wartime efforts to protect its Jewish community against the tragic fate that befell six million of their coreligionists. There is much to be learned from the Bulgarian experience.

And allow me to express appreciation to the German government for hosting this gathering. It is entirely fitting that we assemble here in Berlin, which has emerged, after the infinite darkness of the Shoah, as a bright ray of light in the global campaign against antisemitism.

Distinguished delegates,

Our target audience in this session is youth. In 2000, I led a graduate-level seminar on post-Holocaust issues in Bologna, Italy. As part of the year-long course, I encouraged my students, who came from Europe and the United States, to help me develop an action plan for dealing with contemporary antisemitism and other forms of bigotry—one example of the potential role of students as partners in this process.

Ten components of a comprehensive plan were identified. It is worth sharing them with you in outline form:

- (i) building democratic societies based on the principles of equality before the law and respect for pluralism;
- (ii) recognizing antisemitism when it manifests itself, whatever its source, and facing it squarely, without seeking to diminish it through rationalization or justification;
- (iii) emphasizing the absolutely indispensable role of political leadership—and political will—in educating and mobilizing a nation;
- (iv) ensuring that there are adequate laws to deal specifically with hate crimes, and that law enforcement and the judiciary are up to the task of apprehending and appropriately punishing offenders;
- (v) utilizing the UN Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination, the International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, and other pertinent covenants, together with regional and global forums, such as the OSCE and UNESCO, as legal and diplomatic weapons to combat the purveyors of hatred;

- (vi) encouraging responsible media outlets to focus the spotlight of exposure on acts of hate, and simultaneously ensuring that these outlets are never used, advertently or inadvertently, as vehicles to propagate bigotry and intolerance;
- (vii) building a coalition of conscience in civil society that deems an attack on any group to be an attack on society itself—a kind of nonmilitary collective security pact, if you will;
- (viii) urging religious leaders to emphasize the commonalities that unite the human family, even as each faith defends its distinctiveness, but never by denigration of other religions;
- (ix) developing educational programs for children from an early age that introduce them to historical awareness, mutual respect, social responsibility, moral clarity, and moral courage;
- (x) and celebrating the role of individuals who have made a difference in combating antisemitism and other forms of bigotry, and encouraging others to emulate their example.

Distinguished delegates,

Each of these ten components, I believe, is essential to building a multi-faceted campaign against antisemitism and its related diseases. We must work on parallel tracks and summon the resolve to sustain our efforts. After all, talk is important but only as a first step. It is our action—or inaction—by which we will be ultimately judged. And history has surely taught us that there is no overnight or “wonder-drug” solution for ending the scourge of antisemitism.

In a world buffeted by seemingly endless challenges and plagued by a short attention span, it may prove difficult to focus on a particular issue—in this case, antisemitism—but failure to do so could prove calamitous not only for Jews, but also for the larger well-being of democratic societies.

Antisemitism, we must always remember, is like a localized cancer that, if not properly treated in time, runs the risk of metastasizing and ultimately destroying the entire body.

While each of the ten elements is essential, the key in the long run is education, the subject of this plenary session.

When all is said and done, it is really about the inculcation of a set of civic values in children that teaches them right from wrong and encourages them, as they grow up, to exercise what Jean Piaget, the child development expert, called their “autonomous” morality.

These civic values should include the essential propositions that all children, and their families, are full members of society deserving of respect; that differences arising from such factors as race, religion, or ethnicity are sources of strength, not shame; that hatred based on group identity is inimical to a society’s self-definition; and that society values moral courage.

There are many laudable educational models that have been developed in the United States and Europe to help achieve these worthy, if daunting, objectives. In this regard, I wish to pay special tribute to the work of the member nations of the Task Force for International Cooperation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance, and Research, launched by the Swedish prime minister in 1998, chaired by my fellow panelist, Ambassador Franchetti Pardo, and advised by this session’s chair, Prof. Yehuda Bauer.

I earnestly hope that additional countries represented here at this conference will consider joining the 16-nation task force in the coming months.

Another noteworthy initiative is a new European workshop, cosponsored by the American Jewish Committee and entitled “Education on Anti-Semitism,” which just released a document detailing results of a conference of NGOs and educators here in Berlin. The conclusions emphasize the importance of dealing not only with historical anti-Semitism, but also current trends, including the attempt by some to use anti-Semitic language and images to demonize and delegitimize the state of Israel.

At the American Jewish Committee, we first developed a school-based program two decades ago entitled “Hands Across the Campus.” It is currently being used in many American schools and has recently been adapted for use here in Germany. Its principal objectives are to increase student awareness of the importance of democratic values, civic participation, and diversity, as well as to train student leaders to take an active role in strengthening intergroup relations in their schools.

From our experience with this and other tolerance-building and prejudice-reduction, as well as Holocaust education, programs, we have drawn several lessons that may be helpful to this conference.

First, to maximize the possibility of long-term success, programs must be introduced early on, before a child’s mind is fully shaped, and need to be continued throughout the educational process.

Second, these programs should be woven into the larger curriculum, whether through literature, history, or culture, so that messages are channeled and reinforced from many vantage points.

Third, success depends, above all, on the abilities of teachers themselves, regardless of how well conceived the written material might be. Thus, considerable attention must be paid to teacher training, including clear guidelines on how to deal with those students who resist learning about the Shoah or even deny its existence, as has been the case in some European schools.

Fourth, as the prominent philosopher of education John Dewey emphasized, students learn best when they are active, not passive, participants in the process. It is necessary but insufficient to convey to students the raw facts of the history of antisemitism, culminating in the Shoah, or the more generalized danger of group hatred.

Encounters with victims of hate crimes and survivors of the Shoah, field trips to memorial sites and museums, learning not just about victims’ deaths but also their lives, becoming involved in hands-on projects to counter prejudice and strengthen respect for diversity, and several other vehicles can help translate the abstract or remote into the here and now, without oversimplifying, much less trivializing, historical events.

Jane Elliott, an American teacher, introduced the “Blue Eyes, Brown Eyes” program in her class in 1968 after discovering that many of her pupils harbored racist views of African Americans. She divided the class in two—those with brown eyes and those with blue eyes,

and gave the former rights and privileges that were denied the latter. The exercise worked. The children came to understand the principle of discrimination based on characteristics they had no control over, in this case eye color. They grasped that it could just as easily have been skin color or religious affiliation.

This program has been used extensively, including by a Dutch anti-racism group in South Africa a few years ago. After participating, a fifteen year-old girl remarked, “A racist environment is very easy to create, much more easy than I thought. And the effects for the minority are much worse than I could ever dream of.”

Fifth, emphasis needs to be placed on role models who, by their principled actions, have made a difference. A New York educator was recently honored for her lifelong effort “to eradicate hatred and bigotry through education.” She explained her goal in teaching about the Shoah: “I’m trying to prepare children to be able to deal with racism and bigotry, and give them the tools to speak out, to take the role of the rescuer and not the bystander.”

And sixth, all school-based programs need to be examined periodically to determine if, in fact, they are achieving their desired results. Good intentions, as we know, do not always necessarily translate into good results. There are various ways of determining this—regularly surveying students’ attitudes, designing control groups, and sponsoring longitudinal studies.

Distinguished delegates,

Your commitment to addressing the resurgence of antisemitism through education is vital and deeply appreciated. I hope that, as a result of this conference, more countries will introduce curricula devoted to Holocaust education and civic values into their school systems, and that an OSCE-wide mechanism for reporting and sharing experiences will be developed. But even as we meet here in Berlin to explore what more the OSCE nations can do—and there is much more to be done—we dare not ignore the fact that elsewhere millions of children are actively being taught to hate those who do not share their identity, including, centrally, Jews.

From the schools of Saudi Arabia (a full study of the content of Saudi textbooks is available at www.ajc.org) to the *madrassas* of Pakistan, schoolchildren are presented with a world divided between the so-called “believer” and the “infidel,” and are instructed to abhor the “infidel.”

And evidence of similar teachings has even been found in some religious and educational institutions within the OSCE community of nations.

Not only must the OSCE nations do their utmost to monitor what is being taught within their borders at private schools and academies—I know that some countries already are—but many nations represented here also have ample diplomatic opportunities to express concern to those governments that, directly or indirectly, encourage and fund the poisoning of young people’s minds.

If we are to mount a truly effective campaign against antisemitism, we ignore at our peril this dimension. The widespread use of satellite technology and cyberspace to transmit antisemitic motifs to Europe and elsewhere only heightens the danger still further.

We rightly want our young people to develop the capacity for moral clarity and moral courage in their own lives. We can expect no less of our own governments.

The very same moral clarity and moral courage must be brought to bear in dealings with those nations and groups that actively seek—through the teaching of incitement and hatred, the publication of antisemitic materials, and the spawning of grotesque conspiracy theories—to undermine our shared objectives here in Berlin. We let them succeed only at our collective peril.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the honor today of addressing this distinguished body.



United States Mission to the OSCE

OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism Introductory Remarks For Session 4

As prepared for delivery by Mayor Edward Koch
Head of U.S. Delegation
Former Mayor of New York City
Berlin, April 29, 2004

Thank you, Mr. Moderator

In the interest of expediting the debate and allowing as many interventions as possible from the floor, I will limit myself to laying out a general framework for the issues that relate to anti-Semitism and posing a number of basic questions about the role of the media in conveying and in countering prejudice.

The media can play either a positive or a negative role in the fight against anti-Semitism and other forms of intolerance.

On the positive side, there are many ways in which the media can counter prejudice and promote tolerance. They all have in common that the relevant media figures take their professional duties seriously, that they recognize their responsibility for shaping public views, and that they encourage the voices of reason and humanity.

On the negative side of the equation, we can all cite many examples of articles, broadcasts and websites that stir up hatred and appeal to the most primitive prejudices.

So I'm going to turn over the floor to you, my dear colleagues, with the hope that together we can begin today to find constructive answers to the following questions:

- How can the media report on the activities of minority populations, and specifically of the Jewish communities in our countries, to promote better understanding among the general population?
- Are there ways that governments can encourage the media to report more objectively on domestic developments affecting the Jewish community, or on international developments, while fully respecting freedom of the media? What are the special responsibilities of state-owned media in this regard?
- How can we isolate those extremist publicists who convey anti-Semitic or other hateful messages from the mainstream of respectable, responsible media professionals?

- How should media respond to anti-Semitic statements and images, quickly and firmly, to make sure our populations get an objective view?

My own style is to be blunt, to confront the adversary, to “tell it like it is.” If you’re in the media business, I think you need to report on hate crimes in all their ugliness. But you also need to report on the joys of Jewish life, and the benefits for everyone of living in a tolerant, multicultural society.

If you’re in the education business, you need to make sure that citizens know all about the horrors of the Holocaust. But you also need to teach about the positive experiences of the ensuing decades in overcoming the Nazi legacy in Germany and beyond.

If you are the public consumer of media messages, you need to reject bias and demand fairness. You need to view the media with a critical eye, and to distinguish between responsible and irresponsible journalism. Finally, when you encounter examples of intolerance in the media, even subtle ones, you need to speak out, whether through letters to the editor or e-mails to the producer, or simply by spreading the word in your community. I hope that these broad principles will help to stimulate a fruitful debate this morning.

Thank you, Mr. Moderator.

**OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism
Berlin, 28 – 29 April**

ENGLISH only

Anti-Semitism in Europe

Odd-Bjørn Fure Professor and Director of the Centre for studies of the Holocaust and religious minorities in Norway

The two EUMC reports have shown that anti-Jewish views and stereotypes, and acts of violence against Jews and Jewish institutions, have increased in several European countries during the last few years. In addition, anti-Jewish views and anti-Jewish acts have been disseminated on a near-global scale. This development poses a serious, and very peculiar, challenge to the EU, the European States and European civil society for two reasons. It was in Europe that anti-Semitism led to the Jewish catastrophe. In this socio-political region, anti-Semitism stands in fundamental opposition to the values that both the individual European States and the EU are built on. Anti-Jewish views and acts are not primarily a Jewish problem, even though the victims are Jews, but a problem for civilisation as such. Where anti-Semitism is allowed to spread and acquire significance, it signifies an erosion of civilised codes of conduct. Anti-Semitism and other forms of racism are an attack on the very foundation of civilized societies.

The extensive group of problems that we seek to describe with the terms anti-Semitism or anti-Jewish views and acts in Europe today can be conceived as four relatively distinct issues:

- Firstly, anti-Semitism enters into international relations of power and conflict. The statements that are used within this discursive field to describe anti-Semitism and its dissemination contribute little towards our understanding of the issue.

- Secondly, anti-Semitism is an arena for scientific observation, the gathering of data, interpretation and analysis.
- Thirdly, anti-Semitism results in experiences, namely the Jewish minorities' experience of stigmatisation, harassment and violence.
- Finally, anti-Semitism is a phenomenon that calls for intervention. Anti-Semitism requires the attention of a wide range of players who must seek to establish barriers against anti-Jewish views and acts, and remove some of the foundation for these views and acts. In today's analysis, I will concentrate on this latter aspect.

A number of different groups are currently exposed to harassment and violence in European society. What is specific to the way that the Jewish experience is perceived?

In this connection, there are three aspects that must be emphasised:

- Anti-Semitism is a threat of international dimensions, and thus with existential implications. This threat reaches from anti-Semitic acts in several European countries, via attacks on Israeli tourists in Kenya, to terror attacks by al Quaida against Jewish institutions in Morocco and Istanbul and suicide bombings in Israel.
- The anti-Jewish views, dispositions to act and patterns of behaviour are widely disseminated geographically and in socio-political terms. These views and dispositions flourished in the authoritarian, pre-democratic States in Europe, where. They reflected state doctrines, in the Nazi case, and were fundamental to the acts of the Nazi and Fascist States. The communist States allowed such views to exist, and instrumentalised them politically. Anti-Semitic views and dispositions to act have survived, albeit with restricted leeway, in the democratic Western European and

North American States. Today, they are espoused by large segments of the Arab population, and official propaganda in the Arab nations.

- These threatening events are interpreted – if not always, then at least frequently – against the background of the catastrophe the European Jews suffered in the 1930s and 1940s – a catastrophe in which anti-Semitic inspired patterns of action played a pivotal role.

It is the sum of these three aspects that explains the chasm between anti-Jewish views and acts as described and analysed by social scientists, and as they are experienced and perceived by the Jewish minority in Europe.

The four principal sources and forms of anti-Jewish attitudes in Europe today are:

- Stereotypes that live on within certain Christian communities
- Stereotypes and fundamental beliefs associated with extreme right-wing ideologies
- Anti-Jewish attitudes within left-wing groups that are located on the borderline between anti-Zionism and anti-Semitism
- Stereotypes and acts to be found in some Muslim communities

Jews who have been exposed to anti-Semitic harassment, particularly in France and Denmark, social scientists, and politicians, are all in agreement that there is a connection between the intensity of the conflict in the Middle East and the high incidence of anti-Jewish violence.

This conflict, and how the various European players respond to it, is the dynamic factor in the unfortunate, and potentially tragic, development, namely the relation between Jews and Muslims and between Jews and the majority population in Europe over the last few years.

In the partial report *Perceptions of Anti-Semitism in the European Union*, European Jewish leaders, rightly, complain of criticism that fails to differentiate between the policies of the Sharon government, Israel, and Jews in general. The European Jews are held responsible for the injustices committed by the Israeli government.

"One cannot deny that there exists a close link between the increase of anti-Semitism and the escalation of the Middle East conflict," says the EUMC's first report.

In an important article – *Globalisierung der Emotionen* –, Ulrich Beck has pointed out that the intensity of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict threatens the coexistence of Jewish minorities with the majority communities in Europe. The majority of Europeans do not appear to accept the fundamental distinction between Jews and Israelis. The same process leads to more and more Israelis tending to overlook the similarly fundamental distinction between anti-Semitism and criticism of the acts of the Israeli government. Beck's depressing prognosis is that the more regressive the conflict between Israel and Palestine becomes in terms of civilisation, the more the Europeans internalise it, the more does this threaten the laboriously acquired multicultural forms of association in Europe – and particularly relations between Jews and non-Jews.

Michael Wieviorka has recently stated that the centre for current anti-Semitism lies in the Middle East. He asserts that anti-Semitism primarily emanates from the socio-structural underdevelopment of Arab countries, and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, but that it also has substantial sources outside of the region. As we all know, the European societies have an abundance of such sources. The interaction of the conflict and problems in the Middle-East

region and a broad variety of national and local conditions in Europe is a characteristic trait of the resurgence of anti-Jewish attitudes and acts in recent years.

When the last report of the *European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia* (EUMC) was published, Pat Cox, president of the European Parliament, concluded: "The evidence presented today indicates that incidents of anti-Semitism in Europe are on the increase and suggests that *events in the Middle East are disturbing the social fabric of European society.*"

The conflict in the Middle East has a dual impact:

- Young Muslims who identify with the Palestinians harass and attack Jews. This results in fear and segregation. In many cases, Jews withdraw from formerly well-functioning multicultural neighbourhood communities.
- The conflict appears to create a fissure between the Jewish minority and the European majority population.

What can we do to counteract these processes with their depressing perspectives?

There are those who hold the view that the situation of the European Jews will only be permanently normalised when a peaceful solution is reached between Israel and the Palestinians. Serge Klarsfeld has recently made this claim. With the current political constellations in Israel and the Palestinian Territory, a permanent peaceful solution acceptable to both parties is inconceivable.

But it must also be possible for the European public – for a broad range of European players – to relate to this conflict in such a way as to reduce the likelihood of its leading to the stigmatisation and harassment of Jews in Europe.

I will not, in this connection, dwell on the very obvious fact that the European States and the EU must, by all legitimate means, prevent that the Middle East conflict being is brought onto European territory. My criticism and my proposals will concentrate on what civil society, and particularly the public, can do to eliminate *some of the foundations for anti-Jewish views and actions* that relate primarily to this conflict.

These are based on the assumption that the European mass media and the European public play an important, even decisive, role in the perception of this conflict. In addition to supplying information, the pattern of the information shapes attitudes, views and responses:

- A representation of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict which is *exclusively, consistently and persistently* limited to criticism of the Sharon government's politics can – and in all likelihood will – incite anti-Jewish views, because such criticism implicitly suggests a shared identity between the Israeli government, Israeli society, and the Jewish people. Unfortunately, this type of representation is typical of large parts of the European public.

- It is therefore of fundamental importance to emphasise that Israeli society – or substantial parts of it – are much more than, and in many regards something quite different from, or even diametrically opposed to, what the Sharon government stands for. In this context it is important to highlight the alternatives posed by parts of the opposition, such as Jossi Beilin and Avraham Burgh. The most important instances of such alternative stances are the Geneva protocol, the comprehensive and sharp

criticism of the government by vital parts of Israeli civil society, represented by intellectuals of many shades, the civil courage evinced by the 27 pilots when they refused to drop large bombs over densely populated areas, and the many soldiers and officers who have refused to serve in the occupied territories. It is highly important to convey the vitality of Israeli democracy, even in wartime, and demonstrate the civic values that are being applied in this difficult situation. *Large parts of the European public are failing with regard to this!*

- It is extremely important that the European public take a determined and unreserved stand against the suicide bombers' destructive and barbaric activities, and equally those environments and structures that provide them with support, shelter, and legitimacy. The suicide bombers must be deprived of all political and moral legitimacy. It is important to take a stand, primarily on moral grounds. Mass murder of civilians with a political objective transgresses the most basic norms of civilisation. But it is also important to take a stand against the suicide bombings on political grounds. As long as they continue, it will not be possible to obtain backing for a different political stance, a position based on negotiations, compromise and reconciliation, as signalled by the Geneva protocol. In regard to this, *large parts of the European public suffer from a lack of clarity and of evasiveness.*

- The partial report from EUMC indicates that Jewish leaders in Europe often have a tendency to perceive criticism of the policies of the Sharon government as an expression of anti-Semitism. Serge Klarsfeld goes even further than this. In an article in *Le Monde* he asserts that the new anti-Semitism at the end of the twentieth century is primarily expressed in the rejection of the Israeli State. Criticism of the Israeli

government's policies towards the Palestinian population *is not anti-Semitic* provided that the criticism is being made on the basis of international law and human rights. A perception of a shared identity between criticism of the Sharon government and anti-Semitic views entails that this government's actions are being shielded from legitimate and necessary criticism. The Sharon government *should indeed be criticised* for its massive violation of human rights and international law. The interviews of European Jewish leaders show that many object to being held responsible for the Israeli government's policies, and that they are being subjected to stigmatisation and harassment because they are blamed for the actions of the Israeli government. What we observe here are two processes with an infernal logic that *mutually re-enforce one other*. On the one hand, we have the one-sided representation of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in the European media with their emphasis on the policies of the Sharon-government, and overlooking the political alternatives in Israel. This representation works to erase the distinction between the Israeli government and society, and Jews in general. In addition, the European media hold a confused view on the suicide bombings and the environment and structures they originate in. On the other hand, there is the tendency for criticism of the Israeli government to be perceived as anti-Semitism, and criticism of this government thus being perceived in such a way as also to affect European Jews.

- In his great work, *Das Jahrhundert verstehen. Eine universalhistorische Deutung*, Dan Diner has pointed out that there has been a devaluation of universal values after the breakdown of the bipolar world order around 1990, and greater emphasis has been placed on the particularistic values associated with religion, ethnicity and territory. Both the views of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and the rise of anti-Jewish

stereotypes and actions confirm the validity of this thesis. The limited parameters of identification that are formed on the basis of religion, ethnicity and territory have a tendency to exclude the suffering and tragedies of other groups. Most of those who quite legitimately associate with the Palestinians' suffering ignore the suicide bombings. The same groups also have a tendency to overlook anti-Jewish views and acts in Europe. Here, the European public has failed to be sufficiently watchful, and European civil society has largely failed to take action. Why this lack of ability to act against stigmatisation and harassment of a Jewish minority in Europe? This failure to act stands in marked contrast to the ability to mobilise opinion against the racism of the extreme right. Is the explanation to be found in latent anti-Jewish views, or are these acts being overlooked because the European Jews are associated with the policies of the Israeli government? In either case, we are faced with the necessity of transforming attitudes on a tremendous scale. The fundamental challenge is to *re-emphasise our obligation towards universal human rights and values, and to free these obligations from the narrow parameters of identification based on religion, ethnicity, territories, and particularistic political projects*. There are a number of significant examples or models. The one I would like to focus on is the appeal of the 21 prominent French-Jewish intellectuals in *Le Monde* 6 April 2002. They took a clear stand on universal grounds, both against anti-Jewish views and acts in Europe, the Sharon government's politics against Palestinians, and the suicide bombings in Israel. This intervention is an expression of the finest traditions within universal humanism. The anti-Jewish attitudes and acts in Europe are a reality, and they represent a challenge with huge implications. They can only be fought on the basis of wide, inclusive horizons of identification, of universal values and with an imperative requirement to comply in relation to general codes of civilised conduct.